Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 20, 2007

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a retreat meeting on Friday, April 20, 2007 at 6:00 p.m., at the Three Notched Grill at 5790 Three Notched Road in Crozet, Virginia. Members attending were Bill Edgerton, Jon Cannon, Eric Strucko, Duane Zobrist, Pete Craddock, Calvin Morris, Vice-Chairman and Marcia Joseph, Chairman. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director and Sharon Taylor, Recording Secretary.

Members of the public present included: Mr. and Mrs. King from the City, Anne Mallek and a representative for Free Enterprise Forum.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Ms. Joseph called the retreat meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Agenda:

The Planning Commission had dinner while discussing various issues. The following items were identified as issues to discuss:

- Impact Fees
- Proffers - How to ensure that development provides the correct size proffer to mitigate its impact to the community, particularly dealing with the transportation and traffic issues. How to deal with lack of infrastructure. How to resolve phasing issues. What is the magic line? How to deal with affordable housing.
- Development Activity Report – How to use data to establish trends.
- Easements

The Planning Commission was interested in how they could facilitate their goal of slowing down the growth in the rural areas so that the growth occurred in the development areas. The suggestion that easements could be used to assist in slowing down growth in the rural areas was discussed.

Mr. Zobrist provided an overview on how conservation easements work. He suggested that people, particularly with large farms, need to be educated on the benefits of easements.

The Planning Commission suggested urging the Board to make a commitment to increase the understanding of easements in an effort to conserve the rural areas. It would be helpful to set up programs to provide information on easements to the public.

The Saturday morning retreat will be facilitated by Lee Catlin who will use flip charts to summarize everything the Commission does in light of the bigger picture. The Commission wants to discuss how to use the raw data from the development activity report to come up with some conclusions.

The Planning Commission took no formal action.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m. to Saturday, April 21 at 8:45 a.m. at The Meadows, Route 240, Crozet, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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

Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 21, 2007

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a retreat meeting on Saturday, April 21, 2007 at 6:00 p.m., at The Meadows off of Route 240 in Crozet, Virginia. Members attending were Bill Edgerton, Jon Cannon, Eric Strucko, Duane Zobrist, Pete Craddock, Calvin Morris, Vice-Chairman and Marcia Joseph, Chairman. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Lee Catlin, Community Relations Facilitator and Sharon Taylor, Recording Secretary.

Members of the public present included: Mr. King from the City and Julia ? for Valerie Long.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Ms. Joseph called the retreat meeting to order at 8:45 p.m. and established a quorum.

Agenda:

Mr. Cannon presented a flip chart showing the number of buildings permits in Albemarle County over time relating to new dwelling units and structures in Albemarle County. The numbers relating to the amount of new lots that are being created every year was something else they wanted to look at. They wanted to try to get some sense of the trends both in the rural area and the development area to try to understand what may be behind those trends and what might be the implications for future policy decisions by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. He asked staff to discuss what is going on behind the data and what the data means. Since they were not going to solve all of the land use problems of the county today they need to look for suggestions for further exploration. Perhaps from this broader perspective they could identify some areas that they want to be working in and possibly arrange some structure to push that work forward. Some set of data should be agreed upon that the Commission and the Board of Supervisors can review every year to assess where they are, what the trends seem to be and what adjustments, if any, in policy might be appropriate. Those are the elements that he imagined to be in the discussions.

Mr. Zobrist asked if these numbers represent certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that these numbers relate to the building permits.

Mr. Morris pointed out that Lee Catlin was present to assist and guide the Commission in their discussions.

Mr. Cannon noted that there were two strains of data that they have, but the more complete set is the building permit data. The data shows the break down between the rural areas and development areas and the total number of building permits issued for those areas. From the data he noted several things:

- There are some major events that may have affected these numbers along the way.
- There is a pretty consistent number of building permits issued in the rural areas. The 267 in 1992 is almost identical to the number in 2006. There are some years that are a little higher. But, there has been a pretty steady range. There is not a lot of variation in that.
- One question would be what does that mean. Another question is that an acceptable rate of development in the rural areas. It is a consistent growth in the rural areas. The question is whether that is okay and what will the county look like if this goes on for 10, 20 or 100 years.

- It is a consistent trend that does not appear to be affected by what is happening in the growth area. There is a lot more variation in the growth area. There are lows in some years that put the development in the growth areas close to the low development in the rural areas.

Mr. Edgerton asked what happened in 2002.

Mr. Zobrist noted that the University expanded 500 positions in 2002/2003.

Ms. Joseph said that there were a lot of building permits because of the drought since they thought that there was going to be a moratorium.

Mr. Cilimberg said there were specific large projects that were underway that year, which included an apartment complex. Riverbend was also under development during that time. There were some spikes in the numbers based on apartment projects because they get buildings permits in chunks. These numbers represent dwelling units of various types.

Mr. Edgerton said that they were all individual units.

Ms. Monteith said that it could be anything from a condo to a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that a condo is a form of ownership. A form of use could be a single-family attached to a detached single-family, townhouse, etc.

Ms. Monteith asked if a condo building would be counted as 6 or 1.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the unit count would be the actual number of dwellings. Usually one building permit represents so many units and this is the representation of the units here rather than the actual building permit. The building report is broken down by dwelling unit types. This is the raw number.

Ms. Monteith asked if there was any information on what percentage of these were actually built.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that was a good question. What they were beginning to track now are certificate of occupancy. Ultimately that is the only way they know that something has moved through construction and is ready for occupancy. In the last couple of quarterly reports staff has started tracking certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Strucko noted that they had talked about using this information as a performance measure or indicator of how successful the policies are. Assuming that the goal of the policy is to channel development in the development areas, he had calculated the percentage of the total building permits that occurred in the development area. He asked what percentage and goal they would want to hit. Is it 2/3 or 75 percent or is it more than ½. That is a decision that they would have to think about. But, the low year was 2004 where only 53 percent of the building permits were in the growth area. The high water mark was 2002 when 82 percent of the building permits were in the growth area. From 1992 going to 1996 the percentages are 69, 67, 75, 58, 72, 70, 67, 56, 57, 71, 82, 72, 53, 64, and 55. So the in 2006 it would be 55 percent of the building permits happened in the development area.

Mr. Morris asked what was 2005 and 2003.

Mr. Strucko replied that 2005 was 64 percent and 2003 was 72 percent.

Mr. Zobrist noted that all of the development that went into the city would be in developed areas if they wanted to look at the community as a whole.

Mr. Cannon said that is a good point.

Mr. Zobrist said that the city is probably doing many hundreds a year, but they don't have the data.

Ms. Monteith said that the city is consistently much lower than the county. She had seen the data before and it was significantly different.

Mr. Zobrist said that at any rate that increases the percentage of growth in the developed areas of the county, including the city, which makes it a higher ratio towards the development areas.

Ms. Joseph pointed out that they do have information on the city. It is on the last page of the notebook that says new residential building permits 2006 for the City of Charlottesville.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that was the information submitted by Jeff Werner.

Mr. Strucko suggested that they look at that with the number of easements that have happened over the course of the years.

Mr. Zobrist said that there is one other component that affects their analysis, which was that they are getting other than single-family dwellings in the county.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that is included in the numbers.

Ms. Joseph said that most of what they are seeing in the rural areas is single-family homes.

Mr. Strucko said that as they look at measures or indicators of achieving policy objectives he would look at the two major ones. First, where is the development occurring? Secondly, what is happening in the rural areas? He was encouraged that it was between 250 and 300 each year.

Mr. Cannon asked what events in staff's view affected the totals or what was happening.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that staff had numerous discussions about this and where they could make a difference. The data just before 1992 and back in the 1980's in the rural areas was in the 300 to 400 range. They had risen to that level. It peaks around 440 to 450 during the late 1980's.

Mr. Cannon noted that the numbers in the rural area in 1988 was 287, in 1989 it was 269 and in 1990 it was 245. He did not have any numbers before 1988.

Mr. Ciimberg made the following comments.

- In 1988 the county approved Forest Lakes. In 1989, Forest Lakes began developing. It was by far the most active year to year development they had ever had in the county. They were exceeding 150 to 200 building permits a year in Forest Lakes. That occurred for several years through the early 1990's. He did not know when the number began to slow down because then Forest Lakes South came on. It became a steadier number. Also, Glenmore came on line in the early 1990's. Our opinion back then was that Forest Lakes, Glenmore and some of the other urban developments that they were getting over time caused the initial past numbers for the rural areas to fall.

- In the 1980's they did not have any choice to speak of in the development areas. There were no real big projects in the city or county going on, particularly for families raising children. Families raising children tended to buy in rural subdivisions. When he came to work at Albemarle County in 1986 there was really nothing for a young family to buy in the development area in the county unless they were buying a resale in Hollymead. Most of what the realtors would show was rural subdivisions. Then Mill Creek came on around 1990. This means that from that point on as the county got other new developments the demand in the rural areas has stayed fairly steady. These are the core people who want to locate in the rural areas and don't see an alternative in a neighborhood within the development areas. The question they have asked is how low they can get this number before they are truly dealing with the absolute minimum that they can expect in a

rural area based on demand. Ultimately, it is going to be demand driven. It is going to be what people want. How low can this go before they really are at that level?

- Mr. Graham's observation looking at the multiple listing service data about a year ago was that primarily what they were finding for sale in the rural areas was $600,000 and above. It was the more expensive housing. Primarily what they saw in development areas was the more medium priced, the $500,000 or below. There is a big difference it seems in just the price points between rural area properties that constitute building permits and development area properties. There is much more variety in housing type and price in the development areas, which are reflected by some projects, such as apartment complexes, that come on in big chunks. This is a pretty steady one dwelling unit type in a certain price point and beyond generally speaking.

- Probably one of the key questions is how do they get the market and which part of the market that is constantly buying in the rural areas to buy in the development areas. The first part of that market is families who are looking for subdivisions to live in where there are other children and amenities. The county was able to pull those amenities into the development area back around 1990 when Forest Lakes, Western Ridge, Highlands, Glenmore and Mill Creek, etc. were on line. They are doing a good job maintaining that part of the market, but what they are not yet being able to do to any great degree is to get the person who wants to get 5 acres and a ¾ million dollar house to locate in the development area.

Mr. Zobrist noted that as long as there was beautiful country side they never will.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that the only leverage that they may have to deal with the market is to limit the services in the rural areas. When the water levels drop and water availability becomes an issue it might be another factor that will affect building in the rural areas.

Mr. Zobrist noted that the high cost of development rights and the increased requirements of VDOT in terms of side easements and access have slowed down development. In his view a way to do that is to work with VDOT to increase their standards for what they are going to permit what goes on out there. These VDOT standards do slow down growth. They have moved the site distance from 350' to 600'.

Mr. Strucko noted that when someone comes in for a request for a private road they can say no. They can say that it has to be a public road that meets VDOT standards.

Ms. Catlin reiterated that the Commission wanted to get an understanding from this conversation about what the data is telling them. She wanted to make sure that they captured that. Also, it should include a little bit about Mr. Strucko's idea of what data sets or indicators do they really want to track. In other words, what are those things on an annual basis they can put on their report card to ask how they are doing? She asked for input from each Commissioner on what they felt were the major issues and what they hoped to accomplish from their discussions. She asked that the Commission discuss their expectations to make sure they accomplish what the group hopes for.

The following items were identified as issues to discuss:

- RA development consistent. What tools can help us bring this down. What is Planning Commission role in this (service provisions?
- How does that project over time?
  - 10,000 existing parcels or lots
  - 50,000 potential development rights

- Development Area potential, inventory significantly higher than demand.

- Tipping point between 2 district markets

- Keeping urban areas desirable not disrupting existing community

Mr. Edgerton noted that there will come a point when they have destroyed the rural area if they continue on this route.

Mr. Cilimberg said that based on the number of underdeveloped lots, which is about 10,000, even if the county went to the most aggressive rural area down zoning that theoretically with the most restrictive zoning, it is only going to have so much of a difference on this number until a point in time that is way out there.

Mr. Cannon noted that is where the easements come in on the grandfathered lots.

Mr. Cilimberg said that easements would only cover some of those because a lot of it is going to be the small stuff that does not qualify for easements. The other figures out of that 10,000, and the general number of about 50,000 lots, were estimates that could be achieved with development rights. That is theoretical because reality is not until you go in and start doing the plat.

Mr. Zobrist said that if they have that many development rights that the public will figure out how to use them.

Mr. Cannon reiterated that the 50,000 are in addition to the 10,000 lots that already exist.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that would be inclusive of taking everything out and seeing the total amount of lots.

Mr. Cannon said that basically they have lots in inventory now that represent about 1/5 of the total potential lots that could be created in the rural areas.

Mr. Cilimberg replied yes, roughly so. Since they may not be able to go but so far in affecting this total number through the zoning change, what else can they do? They rely on the development areas as the alternative. What is going to make a difference in the development area to begin knocking this number down, even if they don't change any of the zoning, is that a 40 year supply becomes a 60 or 80 year supply or whatever. Right now they were really not able to do a lot here to affect this number with the price points that are out here and what people are wanting. Where can they make a difference? Some of the thought has been that they need to do more Glenmore's in the development areas because they build million dollar homes with amenities and people like to live in that kind of environment. But, even at that they are still going to have some people who don't care about that and just want to live in the country.

Mr. Strucko suggested providing benefits, such as amenities, to living in the designated growth areas such as some life stability that their children will not be redistricted by the rural areas being redistricted first for schools.

Mr. Cannon noted that the lots created in the development area over the last 5 or 10 years have hugely exceeded the actual development. He questioned why that was happening.

Mr. Edgerton said that there are two different markets. As long as the rural areas of Albemarle County offer beautiful home sites in the country and as long as there is a market that it will continue to grow. The kind of person looking for that is not the least bit interested in the development area. He felt that Mr. Strucko's suggestion about the schools was a driver, but that most people don't believe that you can't get water in the rural area or that there is a water issue.

Ms. Monteith asked if staff has a comparable number to the 10,000 projected for the rural areas for the development areas. She asked what is in the development area.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the Comp Plan from 1996 has a total, which was based on the land use categories for residential. But, he could not recall the exact number. That is being done in each of the master plans. They are updating that information to be more current with the master plan land use. That is where that 24,000 figure in Crozet came from, as an example. It is probably up in the 100,000 or more range. The number Mr. Cannon is referring to is the entitled dwelling units through rezoning and

approvals in the development areas. As he said it was an inventory that is even much bigger than what is in the rural area.

Ms. Monteith said that on top of that is what is on the market right now, which is something that they are not throwing in the mix here.

Mr. Cilimberg made the following comments.

- That would be the resales. What they are going to have to do is step away from what they see happening right now in the market. If they go back a year ago and judged things based on the market, they would have thought that they need more inventory than they were even creating now due to increased activity. That is going to fluctuate the natural cycle of real estate as it does this. He felt that the development areas were much more susceptible to this than the rural area. There is going to be a more constant market, too. These are people that don't get affected by the economics of the country or the area. They are moving from wherever they want to. The part that they are trying to figure out is that these people are going to get older and at some point they are not going to want to be in the rural area. That is the point where the numbers in the city become vitally important. Have they created a place where an aging population can live comfortably? They are not just dealing with the present, but also with the future over what they are doing in the development areas. That is why the inventory in the development areas personally does not bother him.

- The question is the quality of that inventory. Is it the inventory of the potential development that they feel will be able to maintain and provide what is necessary for the people who are going to want to live there? It is not going to be so much about the choice between here and here, but it is going to be more about a necessity. If the price of gas goes up and global warming becomes a bigger issue then people all of a sudden will find the urban place unattractive from the standpoint of where they want to live. When they look at the inventory they look at it in terms of what they are getting in that inventory and not what the numbers are. If it is giving us 30 or 40 years of potential development, that is fine as long as it is a quality inventory. The concern Jeff Werner has expressed is if it sets too long the developer and the land owner gets antsy and all of a sudden they don't want to do what they got approved to do because it is not hitting the market and they can't afford to wait 5 or 10 years. Then they are going to come back in and ask for something different that is not going to be the kind of quality that maintains the urban area in the long run.

Mr. Edgerton said that they have to make it more attractive to live in the development area than the rural areas. The aging population is a factor. If the gas prices rise and the school districts and roads are not upgraded, then people might want to go to the development areas. In years past before the automobile people had to live close to work.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that it has always been transportation driven.

Mr. Strucko said that people weigh the amenities in an area to determine where they want to live. In 2002, the Neighborhood Model made it to the Comp Plan.

Ms. Catlin reiterated that they talked about the data and came up with some explanations and some assumptions getting to Mr. Edgerton's point in trying to make the development area more attractive than the rural area and move things in this direction. Is the data telling them that is being done satisfactorily or are things starting to go in that direction? It is too early to tell. One thing to keep an eye on is just raw population numbers. More people every year are living in the 35 square miles within the development area than in the remaining 690 square miles. As that occurs then the urban areas will have more concentrations of population. What does that mean in terms of whether we are keeping those places as they need to be to keep that balance swinging the way they want it to go?

Ms. Joseph agreed that was the point. Are they keeping them? They hear about traffic congestion, overcrowded schools in certain areas and that they don't want any more of this particular activity near us.

It is in places like Forest Lakes and Hollymead. They are making it a less attractive place because they also have aging infrastructure that they have to deal with right now. How does that all fit into this? When they have the Biscuit Run people come in, they know that there are certain things there that are going to exasperate existing conditions. That does not have anything to say about what the additional traffic will be. But, there are existing conditions. So how do they keep it attractive so that people want to live in those areas? If they can get a place out in Greene County for the same amount and don't have to deal with the congestion they are going to move there. How can they change something like that? If they can get people concentrated it will be better for all of us.

Mr. Strucko said that it was the political pressure that they get. Everyone should just say no. How hard is it to just say no to the development request?

Mr. Edgerton suggested that as development occurs they need to provide the infrastructure first. If that can't occur, then they need to somehow phase it or structure it so that it is adequate.

Mr. Strucko pointed out that during the beginnings of the Crozet Master Plan here in this room the concept was infrastructure concurrency. As the development happens, the infrastructure happens. It looks like as they continue to carry out these policies of development in the development areas they have to be more diligent in ensuring that the infrastructure is in place and in figuring out the financials.

Mr. Edgerton noted if they have the legal authority to do it.

Mr. Cannon said that the concern he heard was that they were developing this big inventory in the growth area that they don't know how it is going to be used. They don't know how it is going to be appropriate to use it at the time when the demand comes to actually draw it out. Then why are they creating it all? Maybe the growth area is too big and they ought to be more systematic about gradually expanding the growth area. But, it has been declared and it is up to us to manage. The question is how to keep the growth area dense because ultimately that is the function of it and to keep lots out of the rural areas.

Ms. Monteith said that the growth area has to be attractive, which she was concerned about. First, the idea of creating the growth areas and the Neighborhood Model is pushing everything in the right direction, in addition to asking for more specificity about the developments that are coming forward. From her perspective one of the things that she would be concerned about is that the people who are coming to this community are increasingly sophisticated. If what goes into the growth areas is not at that level of sophistication, i.e. and it becomes very suburbanized in nature, then that is going to end up pushing people more into the rural areas. It is a huge issue that she was not sure how they could get their hands on. They want to make sure that to the extent possible they are providing the neighborhood development in a way that is going to be attractive.

Ms. Catlin said that is a great point. What she was hearing was that this number looks pretty consistent. When you multiply it over time it is frightening. But, in terms of looking at how they can get that number down significantly that is a market that just might be hard to take a big bite out of. So that is one place they want to look. But, the other place they also want to look is what their goal is in this number and keeping this as high as possible through the urban area desirability. What is the Commission's role? Maybe even a more compelling thing right now is how they make sure what their role is in keeping this balance going the way they want it to be.

Ms. Joseph noted that one of the things this group needs to agree to is that they can't do anything in the rural areas.

Mr. Cannon disagreed.

Ms. Catlin said that she thought that was the bang for their buck in terms of where they are committing the most.

Mr. Strucko agreed. He was not ready to accept 250 new building permits each year in the rural areas. There is an existing stock of lots that can meet the demand. Then what policies and tools are available to

us to potentially look at that number and bring it down. We had a long conversation about conservation easements last night. He suggested that they put the number of easements obtained each year next to the other numbers on the flip chart.

Ms. Catlin pointed out that the Board has a strategic goal about the acreage of conservation easements, but she was not sure of the number.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it was 30,000 more acres starting last year up to 2010.

Ms. Monteith asked if that relates to the state mandate that Governor Kaine put out.

Mr. Cilimberg said that Laurie Allshouse had talked about the strategic plan. One of the strategic plan goals was to have over the period of the plan, which is a 5 year plan, 30,000 acres in the county. Governor Kaine got the state to accept a goal of 400,000 acres during his term. There was not a relationship made deliberately. It ended up being coincidental. He felt that they had arrived at the essence of what they want to try to pay attention to in the rural areas. First, they need the data in the rural area to understand not only what the building permit activity is each year, but also what the lot creation is. That is the part that they use to do in the development activity report that they hope by the end of this year they are going to catch up again and be able to provide.

Mr. Cannon agreed that would be important. The other piece would be to know the price information that is relative, comparative and the average prices or some pricing information so that they can see what the market is doing with the available lots.

Mr. Cilimberg said that they want to know this status. They want to know lot creation, which can lead to further permits. They want to know price points or value of what they are getting here versus what they are getting in the other area.

Ms. Monteith said that they need build out, too, rather than just permits.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the rural area build out was part of what the master plans are going to be determining. On the rural area part is the data that they need. What would be important to do, which they could arrange to do on an annual basis, is that there are other Comprehensive Plan strategies for the rural areas, which have been carried over into the county's strategic plan that indicate that they want to do other things. He felt that one thing that might be good to do is compare the data and concerns they have, such as the tipping point question, and whether they can lower this number and compare that to those strategic initiatives. They could say what of any of these strategic initiatives that they are looking at, cluster and phasing were two of them, and compare those initiatives against what they want to achieve that is a lower number here. There are other things beyond that being considered, such as the Board considering not allowing any roads to have access ways on critical slopes and those kinds of things. They need to ask themselves if this is an initiative that would do that or not. How is this initiative being carried out right now? So they can do an assessment of the initiatives against the numbers they are seeing and the concerns they have. That will provide a real focus for the rural area.

Ms. Catlin noted that in the development area they could actually do the same thing because there are strategies that the Board has put in for improving the desirability of the development areas as well.

Mr. Edgerton noted that the Neighborhood Model principles need to be held firm in order to get quality in the development area.

Some of the issues that the Planning Commission can look at in the rural areas include the following:

- Certain amenities being undesirable in the rural area such as cell phone entitlement in the country.

- Water issues, which includes the availability.

- Critical Slope Issues – to strictly uphold the regulations.

Ms. Catlin reiterated that the Commission said that a step forward from here or a concrete action that the Commission could take is holding a focused discussion on what tools do they have as the Planning Commission that they can use to impact that number in the rural area. It could be a service provision, etc. or to look at the strategic plan objectives, accessing them and how they match up and how can they support and reinforce them. In addition to that, are there other things that they have at their disposal that they can do concretely to really get at the rural area? They could do a similar discussion with the urban area piece as well. The idea that they want the flip side in how do they keep the numbers here coming in. In our role as the Planning Commission what tools do they have at their disposal that they can inject into the process?

Mr. Cilimberg made the following comments.

- The development area is much more complicated because the development areas are going to present all of the challenges of the people who are concerned about impact on the infrastructure. It is much more immediate in their minds. If one lives in the rural area and they add a house it is like the frog in the water. But, it is much more obvious to people when they are talking about 3,100 homes. They think of it as being fairly immediate even though it will take years to happen. The challenges of the development area are going to be much more evident to them. It will require somewhat of a different look at how development area build out compares to our ability to do it in the right way.

- First of all, they try to look at every project that they see based on the project and how it fits within the area. In other words, how is it meeting the principles of the Neighborhood Model within the project? The next point is much more challenging, which is the external issues such as the infrastructure and whether it is sufficient to support it and the relationship to other areas around it. Where they run into the greatest public concern is what is happening beyond the project. If the project is right, but all of the impacts are hard, then what do they do about that. In the ideal world there would be a fair share of contribution from the development and the county would be putting up a share of money. Then there would be state monies to put into it making sure that these areas that they want the developer developing in the right way so that they were getting the right kind of infrastructure and the amenities that they need, public and private, as part of the development not only within the project, but also external to it. Unfortunately, they don't have those mechanisms easily at hand to do that. So what they have to figure out is how they can overcome the challenge of infrastructure. For example, Jarman's Gap Road until it is built like it needs to be is a restrictor. In turn it restricts the opportunity of Old Trail, Bargeman and Waylands to actually have a good relationship to downtown Crozet. That is a public obligation that they have not been able to meet yet. They have those kinds of situations all over the place.

- What the Board has decided is that in our master planning they are not just going to master plan for the ultimate build out, but they are suppose to also decide what is going to happen over 20 years. The question is in 20 years what it is going to look like. What are they going to have to try to accomplish. What the Board has said is that they want staff to give a projection of what the development need is going to be for 20 years in that master planned area and to identify where the priority areas should be for the development to occur for infrastructure investment to be made because they can't do everything.

Mr. Zobrist agreed that was the phasing piece.

Mr. Cilimberg said that is where they would be seeing some relationship between the project and the external impacts.

Mr. Cannon noted that would be very helpful.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it has already been presented with Pantops and it will be part of Places29. That means for the future when the Commission is making a decision and it is not in the designated priority

area that it is either not going to get approved or they are going to have to step to the table with a lot more than what the guy in the priority area does. There are some concerns about designating priority areas. But, they have to realize that they can't have it both ways. If the concern is about in a limited capacity with limited resources where they can't do the ideal thing of building out the development areas with the entire infrastructure that is needed, then they are going to have to make decisions on where they can commit infrastructure investment and on developing in accordance with that. That is what the Board ultimately got to.

Mr. Zobrist asked what other strategies might be available in terms of safety issues at the site if there are traffic issues at the site.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that if there are such issues there is a potential for it to be denied.

Ms. Monteith asked if it was possible for the Commission to have a work session focused on the two issues around rural areas in contrast with discouragement versus encouragement of the development.

Mr. Cilimberg replied yes, that they would just have to find the time.

Ms. Catlin said that if the Commission was putting that together and wanted to prepare what would they need. They talked about some data or indicators that would be important for them to know. They talked about the lot creation in the rural area and the development area. They compared price information. They mentioned build out information, some of which is coming through in master planning and some which is available in other ways. What other kinds of information would be helpful to the Commission in preparing to have
this kind of discussion.

Ms. Monteith clarified that in build out she was talking about things from the larger planning perspective. She meant what has actually been developed versus what permits have been pulled.

Ms. Catlin reiterated that it was occupancy versus building permits.

Mr. Strucko said that he was impressed with some of the things Mr. Cilimberg had said. The resource limitations of the community determine what gets built or completed first. That is probably the target zone within the growth area concept. The Board of Supervisors really has to wrestle with that and the tax rates. They wrestle with issuing debt to finance things. But, what is the Planning Commission's role in this. They don't have the power of the purse. But, they do have the power to review proffers. That is a third source of resources. The Board needs to start working on the policy to give the Commission a sense of direction as to what they are expecting in terms of proffers. Luckily the Fiscal Impact Committee is starting to add a little momentum to that discussion. What will be put in front of them are some dollar arrangements that are pretty interesting. For a single-family detached they are in the $14,000 range per unit. That is the cost of Albemarle County capital today. This community accepted $3,200 from Gayland Beights from Old Trail. He felt that the developers and the legal representatives are calling it a precedent.

Ms. Catlin said that he had made a good point. But, the Development Review Task Force that Ms. Joseph has sat on has some high priority recommendations for the development of an expanded proffer policy that will give guidance.

Mr. Strucko said that for a combination of issuing debt, such as bonds, tinkering with the tax rate and creating a proffer policy perhaps that gives us the critical mass of financial resources necessary to finally get around to improving Jarman's Gap Road.

Mr. Edgerton questioned if they want to improve that. If they improve that infrastructure they are encouraging development.

Ms. Joseph noted that was development in the growth area.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that on the Six Year Road Plan there are a lot of roads that are not in the development area.

Ms. Joseph said that those roads should not be in the plan.

Mr. Edgerton agreed that the rural area roads in the Six Year Plan should be taken off of the list.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that there were not many roads in the rural areas on the Six Year Road Plan. They scaled that back a few years ago because of the Comp Plan. He did not think that the projects listed in the top 20 were in the rural area, but were all related to the development area.

Ms. Catlin said that there was a consensus about the idea of a work session of some form or fashion to really flush out some ideas that have been thrown out, but they really would work out some ideas to get to the tools here in terms of preparing for it in terms of what data would be helpful for the Commission in making some of those decisions. What other kinds of things?

Mr. Edgerton replied that the infrastructure decisions that the Commission/Board are involved in and whether it is improvements to roads and where they are located, etc. would be helpful.

Ms. Catlin said that would include the CIP budget.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it was where they were spending their money basically.

Mr. Edgerton added and whether it would facilitate development where they don't want it or slow it down in areas where they do want it.

Ms. Monteith said that she had no idea whether anybody has any information on this, but is there a larger intelligent on what properties in the development areas that are likely to go on the market or be acquired next that they could appropriately acquire. She asked if there was a larger tracking mechanism for that.

Mr. Zobrist noted that in Crozet it was about 70 percent done. There is not a lot to acquire.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that on 29 North it is Wendell Wood.

Mr. Zobrist said that on Pantops it is Charles Hurt and Steve Runkle. The major development that is going to occur in the development area is happening as they speak.

Mr. Edgerton said that was a good question.

Ms. Monteith said that it was just to get an idea of where development was going.

Mr. Cilimberg said that what she might be thinking was what is left.

Ms. Monteith asked how they could make the development areas more attractive by having a better understanding of what is available and how those areas can be instituted.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the master planning was an attempt to influence those areas. The point is in what is left and there are many owners that may never come together to develop versus where there are larger holdings under one ownership. It is the ownership that is correlated to what is left.

Ms. Joseph noted that infrastructure was not only roads. It has a lot to do with our water and sewer, too, which they don't have a handle on.

Ms. Monteith said that it is also transit opportunities, which was part of what she was thinking when she asked about where these larger pieces might be left out. How can they influence this from a multi-model perspective?

Ms. Catlin said that the idea is that the Commission would like some thought and direction given for the creation of two different work sessions to have the opportunity to be able to talk through these two issues. The first work session would be on the rural areas. The second work session would be on the development area. The Commission would like this kind of data put together.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that some of the information would not be available for a while.

Mr. Zobrist said that it was important to include public comment. It would be helpful for the public to understand their policy to slow down growth in the rural area and increase the development area. He did not think that people understand that.

Ms. Catlin noted that the shift in population has made a big different in their public participation issues.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested that if the Commission was comfortable with the idea of two work session on the rural areas and the development areas that staff would take this and come up with a summary and get it back to them to sign off on. Then they will start thinking ahead and planning on where they can program this in.

Ms. Monteith said that 2, 3 and 4 pertain to the development area.

Mr. Cannon asked to know what the new legislation on impact fees is. That is a potential tool for the Commission. He would also like input from Greg Kamptner.

Ms. Joseph said that they could talk about that under rural areas. That may have an impact on by right development. Maybe that should be a work session by itself.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that will be a discussion by itself with the Board actually. There are going to be two discussions with the Board that will probably run concurrent with the cash proffer policy discussion. One is about changing the references in the zoning ordinance and the section of the State Code that they use for conditional zoning, which is the proffer zoning. They have now been enabled to use the more liberal conditional zoning enabling legislation that has been used in Fairfax. They are now under that allowance. The second is the new impact fee legislation, which is only for transportation and how that could potentially work in Albemarle and whether or not they would want it to be available for the entire county or only parts of the county. That is something that will be discussed in the future.

Mr. Zobrist asked that they discuss to the extent to which our policies drive people to the surrounding counties that still come back here and work. He asked if they need to accommodate those issues.

Ms. Joseph noted that was all about affordable housing, too.

Ms. Monteith noted that on the transportation impact they talked about it at the MPO Board this week. So staff might want to talk to Mr. Keller about the person that they had come in and speak to summarize that. It might be helpful.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that issue might surface at the May Day Board meeting. The Development Process Committee's recommendations are going to the Board at that time, which also includes the Cash Proffer Policy. He recommended that the Commission check the website and he would let them know what time that would be. That day meeting is where those two things will be discussed.

Mr. Morris thanked Mr. Cilimberg and Ms. Catlin for their assistance.

Mr. Cilimberg and Ms. Caitlin left the meeting.

In summary, the Commission discussed the following issues:

1. What is the data telling us? There are some policy implications?
    - Lot creation in rural area and development area/comparative price information.

2. What data sets/indicators do we want to track?
3. (Master Planning) Occupancy vs. building permits.

Other items discussed were:

The rural area figures are pretty consistent and stable over time. One kind of inference they can get from the data is that development in the rural area over the last 10, 15 or 20 years has been pretty consistent at an average pace. They have not said why.

- What tolls can help us bring this down? Relate to strategist plan objectives/assessment.

1. Service provisions – What is the Planning Commission's role in this? How does that project over time?
   - Development Area potential inventory significantly higher than demand.
   - Tipping point between 2 district markets
   - Keeping urban areas desirable not disrupting existing community

The Planning Commission took a break at 10:26 a.m. and the meeting reconvened at 10:51 a.m.

The Commission continued their discussion noting the following points:

- It is not just the young people with children who are moving into the urban areas. Many nonworking and home based business retirees are relocating in this area.

- There are always going to be people who want the 5 acre piece in the rural area.

- There are many people as they age that want to move into the city.

- A lot of people want to live downtown, but there is not enough housing stock variety.

- It is interesting that the people in the city don't realize that everything that they get as far as water, etc. comes from the surrounding county for all of the people who provide services. Without the county, the city would dry up. Therefore, they have to increase this partnership. The water issue is a major concern that is going to cost millions of dollars due to the siltation in the reservoir and streams. It is being caused by bad agricultural practices as much as development. People are planting right up to their streams and leaving no buffers. Failing infrastructure is a concern.

- Quarterly or annually the Commission needs to step back and see if they are accomplishing what they set out to accomplish. They need to look at the water issues, etc. Perhaps the policies should be a strategic application of easements and focus ACE to do just that.

- The Commission needs trigger points as they approve developments to be able to acknowledge the accumulated effect of all of the developments in that particular area that they have approved in a piece mill fashion to determine what infrastructure they have gotten for that area.

- Do they have the notion of what projects are going to happen in the future in evaluating their future infrastructure needs? The master planning process should help with this. They need to start accumulating cash in proffers to handle the infrastructure needs for a particular area.

- The Commission tasked staff to create maps of the various areas and when something comes up this is where it is. The maps should show the other things that are already going on or in the process. They need to be able to look at that piece of expected development to help visualize what the impacts would be.

- The consistency of the staff reports is very important.

- Designate areas in Comp Plan where certain items that are needed in a particular area are designated.

- The three items the county has to balance is through the tax rate, proffers and debt. The Commission needs a sense of direction from the Board on the proper balance for the proffer piece.

- The number of acres each year that have gone into easement was discussed. Mr. Strucko tried to draw a correlation, but could not find any because there was not enough land in easement yet. The critical mass has not been reached yet so that there is this correlation.

- There is a lag time between what they do and any changes that might occur in those numbers even if they are doing everything right. That is why they have to look at trends.

- It was suggest that they could tighten up on the standards for stamping a plan on by right development, which would slow the growth down a little more.

- If they extend the critical slope legislation county wide that would slow down the growth.

- Transit needs to be interspersed throughout the development areas and its use encouraged cutting down on the number of cars on the already congested roads.

- The Commission noted that there was no affordable housing policy. It is confusing and incomplete. The guidelines need to be clarified. The affordable housing demand needs to be coordinated to ensure that with the 90 day notice that there is going to be a family ready for the unit.

- A lot of the places for affordable housing are not central to the city for people who have to depend on public transportation to get from place to place. They also may feel that they will be isolated from the community, which needs to be closer to town. Both from a social and physical point of view moving out to these places where they would be isolated physically and socially might not be desirable. That was a first read.

- The affordable housing should be closer to the employment centers and should be interspersed. It needs to be tied in with transit availability. The Commission asked how many people use transit at this time. Is massive transit effective for these people to get to their jobs? If not, what can be done to improve it?

- The Commission asked for information/data from Ron White as to what is going on in affordable housing in Albemarle County so that they can understand what is actually needed in the proffer. Mr. White needs to coordinate the housing organizations in the community that the county partially fund as well as coordinate the list of demand so that they have to have a family ready to go within the 90 day period. They need to know how many units have built over time because to date there are not affordable units. What is the success rate?

- The Commission asked staff to schedule a work session on affordable housing. It was noted the Commission should attend the upcoming Board work session on affordable housing.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 24, 2007 at the County Office Building, Room 235, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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