Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 22, 2007

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, May 22, 2007, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Pete Craddock, Duane Zobrist, Bill Edgerton, Eric Strucko, Calvin Morris, Vice-Chairman; Marcia Joseph, Chairman and Jon Cannon. Julia Monteith, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Amelia McCulley, Zoning Administrator/Chief of Zoning & Current Development; John Shepherd, Chief of Current Development; Judith Wiegand, Senior Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Lee Catlin, Community Relations Manager and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

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

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Ms. Joseph invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting moved on to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – May 9, 2007.

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on May 9, 2007.

Consent Agenda:

Resolution of Intent to amend the Zoning Ordinance – Proffers (Greg Kamptner)

Ms. Joseph asked if anyone wanted to pull the item off of the consent agenda.

Motion: Mr. Edgerton moved, Mr. Morris seconded, for approval of the consent agenda.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Ms. Joseph noted that the consent agenda was approved.

Item Requesting Deferral:

ZMA-2007-00001, Hollymead Town Center Area A-2 (Signs #93, 94)
PROPOSAL: Rezone approximately 45 acres from RA zoning district which allows agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses, residential density (0.5 unit/acre); and to rezone approximately .5 acres from C-1 Commercial which allows retail sales and service uses, and residential use by special use permit (15 units/ acre); and to rezone approximately .4 acres from NMD Neighborhood Model District zoning district which allows residential (3 - 34 units/acre) mixed with commercial, service and industrial uses; and to rezone approximately 3,000 square feet from PD-MC Planned Development Mixed Commercial which allows large-scale commercial uses, and residential by special use permit (15 units/ acre); to NMD Neighborhood Model District zoning district which allows residential (3 - 34 units/acre) mixed with commercial, service and industrial uses. The application proposes up to 1,258 dwelling units.
PROFFERS: Yes
EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Town Center -- Compact, higher density area containing a mixture of businesses, services, public facilities, residential areas and public spaces, attracting activities of all kinds. (6.01-34 dwelling units per acre).
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes

LOCATION: West and adjacent to the Hollymead Town Center Area B, which contains Target and Harris Teeter, east of the Forest Springs Mobile Home Park and Deerwood Subdivision and north of a tributary of Powell Creek west of Route 29.
TAX MAP/PARCEL Tax Map 32, Parcels 44 (portion), 45 (portion), and 50
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rio
STAFF: Sean Dougherty
APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO THE JULY 17, 2007 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Ms. Joseph noted that the applicant has requested deferral to July 17, 2007. She opened the public hearing and invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Commission.

Mr. Craddock asked why the applicant requested deferral.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the applicant was still working on design aspects with staff and just went before the Architectural Review Board yesterday.

Motion: Mr. Zobrist moved, Mr. Morris seconded, to approve the applicant's request for deferral of ZMA-2007-00001, Hollymead Town Center Area A-2 to July 17, 2007.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Ms. Joseph stated that ZMA-2007-00001, Hollymead Town Center Area A-2 was deferred to July 17, 2007. She asked to talk about this rezoning request under old business concerning a telephone call she received yesterday from the Chair of the Architectural Review Board who is requesting that they might talk about this project with them. Therefore, the Commission could talk about that later under old business.

SUB-2007-00120, Pounding Branch Subdivision (Phase II) – Preliminary
Request for preliminary subdivision plat approval to create 15 lots [fourteen (14) development lots and one (1) preservation lot] as a Rural Preservation Development on 242.26 acres. The property, described as Tax Map 72 - Parcel 54 and Parcel 32A (portion), is located in the Samuel Miller Magisterial District on Dick Woods Road [Route 637] and Pounding Creek Road [Route 689] approximately .53 miles east of the intersection with Miller School Road [Route 635]. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Areas in Rural Area 3. (Megan Yaniglos)

Ms. Joseph noted that the applicant was requesting a deferral. She invited public comment. There being none, she asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Morris asked why the applicant was requesting a deferral.

John Shepherd, representative for Current Development, replied that the applicant is requesting a deferral of this matter because it came to their attention yesterday that there was a discrepancy in the by right plan as compared to the actual proposed plan. It was something that needs to be revised before it can be put heard by the Commission. The applicant will bring back a corrected plan.

Mr. Zobrist said that since it was part of three different plans that it made it difficult to figure out. He asked if there was some reason it was coming by itself rather than with the whole area. He would be a lot more comfortable if he could see everything that they are applying on there as opposed to just one sliver. There were three or four phases on the one map they received. This is a very small portion of the whole plan.

Mr. Shepherd replied that the ordinance limits the number of lots that can be created with a rural preservation development to 20. Therefore, the plans have to be separate. But, he would discuss with the applicant the possibility of showing an overall plan that will put them all into context so that they can see how this all fits together.

Mr. Zobrist felt that would be helpful because it is very difficult to evaluate. Since they are tied together it would be very helpful for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Shepherd replied that he would convey that to the applicant.

Motion: Mr. Morris moved, Mr. Edgerton seconded, for approval of the applicant's request for deferral of SUB-2007-00120, Pounding Branch Subdivision (Phase II) – Preliminary.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Ms. Joseph stated that SUB-2007-00120, Pounding Branch Subdivision (Phase II) – Preliminary was deferred.

SDP 2005-083 Rio Truck Repair - Request for preliminary site plan approval to allow the construction of an 8,000 square foot building to be used for truck repair on property described as Tax Map 61 Parcel 146. The subject parcel contains approximately 1.428 acres and is zoned C1 (Commercial). This site is located at the end of Rio School Lane approximately 370 feet east of its intersection with Rio Road (State Route 631). This site is located in the Rio Magisterial District and is designated as Neighborhood Service in Urban Area 2. (David Pennock)
DEFERRED FROM THE APRIL 17, 2007 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Ms. Joseph noted that the applicant was requesting deferral on this request.

Mr. Shepherd replied that was correct and that the applicant was present and could speak about it. He understands it to the extent that there are questions about the whole issue about the off site improvements that are being asked for. Staff would like some time to work on that longer before bringing it back to the Commission. Both staff and the applicant are agreeable to that. This time will be well spent. Staff asks to reschedule the request to the 26th of June or later, but no sooner than that.

Ms. Joseph opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Corban King, attorney for Peter Van de Linde, said that he was happy with the suggestion to defer the request for a month or so, but not for a year.

Ms. Joseph invited public comment.

Bud Treakle said that he represented Bill and Anne Debutts who own one of the adjacent properties. They found out today from conversations with the County Attorney and staff that the matter was going to be deferred. His clients are not available the last week of June. Therefore, they ask that it be the first week of July or later. They want to come back and readdress this issue with the Commission if at all possible. Other than that they don't need to address anything or take any of the Commission's time tonight. They can address it at a later date.

Ms. Joseph asked the applicant and staff if it would be acceptable to meet the first week of July.

Mr. King replied that would be fine.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the first meeting in July was July 3, which they also were going to ask the Commission tonight whether they wanted to do a Places29 work session that night. They are able to do it, but being the night before July 4 they were not sure about the Planning Commission.

Mr. King replied that Mr. Van de Linde and he would be available the following week.

Mr. Treakle note that the following week his clients would be gone again.

Mr. King suggested that he get with Mr. Treakle to work out the date.

Ms. Joseph said that was a good idea and suggested that the Commission defer indefinitely.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that would their normal action actually to just defer and let a date be set by staff.

Mr. King said that he would prefer that it not be deferred indefinitely for another year.

Ms. Joseph said that it was not the intent of the Commission that it be deferred for a year.

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

Motion: Mr. Edgerton moved, Mr. Morris seconded, for approval of the applicant's request for indefinite deferral of SDP-2005-083, Rio Truck Repair.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Ms. Joseph stated that SDP-2005-083, Rio Truck Repair was indefinitely deferred.

Work Session:

Places29 Master Plan – Introduction to the Plan: Staff will present a proposed format and schedule for a series of work sessions on the Places29 Draft Master Plan. These work sessions are intended to provide an opportunity for the Commission's initial review and comment on the draft chapters, as well as for staff to ask for guidance on questions and issues. The proposal also addresses public comment opportunities: chapters will be available on the Places29 website and two work sessions devoted to public comment are included. (Judith Wiegand)

Ms. Joseph pointed out that Mr. McGowan, of the North Charlottesville Business Council, was present to discuss some of the concerns of the group. She invited Mr. McGowan to come forward and talk about those issues.

Mike McGowan, Chairman of the North Charlottesville Business Council, said that they are a group with about 70 paid members that represent most of the major landowners and businesses along the 29 Corridor. They have been active in the planning process for things going on along Route 29 for the last almost 20 years. They have been involved with the Places29 process since the beginning. Recently they wrote a letter to Mr. Ken Boyd and the Board of Supervisors about the process and where they were. That is the reason he was invited to speak to the Commission this evening. He made the following comments regarding the Places29 master plan project:

- Back in 2006 the group issued a policy statement stating that their two major interests in 29 were making it a special place and making it a place that unified the community. These 2 concerns were broken down into basically beautification projects for making it a special place by providing pedestrian cross walks with different paving, having landscaping in the center island that was consistent with the landscaping one would expect on property nearby, having maintenance of the islands so that they did not have the mulch volcanoes and dying trees out there so to have a type of landscaping that was appropriate for their community in a public right-of-way and those types of things. It also included having consistent signage and signage that was attractive, which was not necessarily the express way type of signage that have gone across the Sperry part of the highway at this point. They want signage that they would be proud of as a community.
- In terms of unifying aspects of the plan they support the connectivity in things like Hillsdale, Meadow Creek Parkway, etc. Those are parts of the plan that they supported. They support pedestrian and bicycle paths along Berkmar and across the area.
- The group asks that they look at things like adding lights on 29. One of the reasons they think that the intersections break down is that the traffic does not have any choice and it piles up at the intersections since there are no alternative ways to turn. Their vision of 29 has always been an urban boulevard. On an open boulevard traffic may move slower than on 29, but there are more choices for local users in terms of crossing the street on foot or by car. Those are the concerns that they expressed from the beginning.

- They participated in the process. After the 3 frameworks they commented that they agreed with several aspects of the plan, but they were concerned that at that point there was not enough information available to make informed decisions about the plan.
- When the last plan came out and they moved forward to this current status of things they were concerned that they were moving forward with a plan that did not have the support of some of the land owners who were key people that would have to be cooperative to have the plan work. Without that they did not want to see the community put into the annoyance and the give and take that this community goes through in trying to approve and discuss a plan unless it was a plan that they could actually realize. They think that it is important to have a plan that can work and that can happen because that is what they are all about here.
- Therefore, they wrote to Mr. Boyd about a few things that the group was concerned about. Rather than going into the litany of those things, which he would be happy to do, he would say that after writing to Mr. Boyd and talking to him, getting a call from Harrison and Judy and communicating with them, they have set up some work sessions with the land owners and the people involved that are going to occur in late June and over the summer. They think that it is appropriate not to move forward aggressively with any of the plan to start the approval process until they are sure it is something that would work.
- Therefore, that was what he was her to report this evening and to say there are parts of it that they are concerned about. One example is the intersection of Rio and 29 where part of the overpass/underpass and other connections rely upon travel through adjacent properties and shopping centers in order to make the connections that normally would occur at ramps and overpasses. They have not been able to find a single property owner who agrees with the way that is set up. If these property owners don't want to see it happen as it is drawn, then it does not work.
- They will have some work sessions and see if may be someone is mistaken or can be educated in terms of how it could work. Then the group will come back to the Commission. They wanted to make people aware of some of these issues before they move forward too aggressively with a plan and then slam the brakes on later because it may or may not work. He thanked the Commission for allowing him to speak tonight.

Mr. Morris asked if he could describe who he envisioned being at the work sessions.

Mr. McGowan noted that was discussed with staff. They would invite everyone who owns land the same way that they would at a zoning hearing, members of our organization who are not and any Supervisors or Planning Commission members who wanted to come. It would be a meeting that would not be open to the full public at large, but to the people who have property that was directly involved and businesses directly involved. It would be done so to keep it to a workable number of folks with direct involvement.

Mr. Edgerton noted that if the meeting was not open to the public only two Commissioners would be able to participate. It would be the same for the Supervisors due to the requirements under state law.

Mr. McGowan replied that they would have to address that issue.

Mr. Cannon asked if they plan to have staff present.

Mr. McGowan replied yes that Ms. Wiegand and Harrison Rue would be present.

Mr. Morris asked if the work shops would be held during the time that the consultants would be here.

Ms. Wiegand replied that they did not expect that, although they might Kathy Galvin, the local representative to be there.

Ms. Joseph thanked Mr. McGowan for taking his time to come and speak to the Commission. The Commission would talk about the scheduling next.

Mr. McGowan suggested that it might make sense to push some things back to make sure they have a plan that works for the entire community before they get too far.

Ms. Joseph asked if there were any persons present that would like to speak to Places29. There being none, she asked staff to present the staff report.

Ms. Wiegand summarized the staff report and presented a power point presentation. (See Attached Staff Report and Power Point Presentation.)

- She thanked Mr. McGowan for coming tonight to talk. They are very happy to work with the North Charlottesville Business Council and have been meeting with them since the beginning. She agreed with him on all of the ones he mentioned and noted that they also have a certain concern over the intersection with Rio and 29 that he used as an example. That is one of the areas that was proposed for a small area plan. She thinks they can continue to work with them and with property owners and have a plan that the community will be able to support.

- Tonight staff would like to discuss the next step in the ongoing review process for Places 29. Tonight's discussion about the series of work sessions is not about approval. This is continuing review. Staff continues to be responsive to the questions that they have from the community. They are still willing to meet with the community. It is by no means too late. They will be happy to do all of those things.

- Staff proposes a series of work sessions during which they want to give the Commission the opportunity to review the Master Plan on a chapter by chapter basis. They are proposing this chapter by chapter review to be followed by a discussion of the full plan because it will give staff the opportunity to forward any concerns or questions the Commission has back to the consultants while they are still working on the plan and they are still under contract to the county. There will be at least one work session at the end where they can go over the full plan and look at the ramifications of how everything works together.

- First, staff will provide a description of the staff review of the master plan text and how it leads into the Commission's review of the plan. Then staff will discuss the proposed work sessions, including the public comment work sessions. Staff would like to conclude by going through the four questions posed in the staff report on the first page.

    1. Does the Commission agree with the proposed general format for these work session?
    2. Is it acceptable to hold the first public comment work session during the first week in August?
    3. Are there other opportunities for public comment that the Commission would like staff to employ?
    4. Does the Commission have any revisions to this program of work sessions before staff shares it with the Board of Supervisors on June 6 and the public?

- The Consultants have shown us:
    - ❖ Alternative land uses and transportation networks
    - ❖ Place Types – illustrations
    - ❖ Presentations to explain map & illustrations
    - ❖ And there have been many opportunities for public comment.

- Now, it's the Text!
    1. Consultants draft each chapter, with maps and illustrations
    2. Staff – county, TJPDC and VDOT reviews and sends comments back to the consultants
    3. Consultants revise each chapter and return
    4. Staff brings revised chapters to the Commission during work sessions

- The Chapters are proposed as follows:
    1. Introduction
    2. Vision & Guiding Principles
    3. Existing Conditions & Future Trends
    4. Place Types
    5. **Future Land Use & Transportation Framework**

6. Community Facilities & Services
7. Unified Design Guidelines
8. **Implementation**

- The Master Plan "Package" will include the following:
  - Executive Summary
  - The Master Plan
  - Appendices

- Discussion of the proposed work sessions, including public comment work session

- The Planning Commission reviewed staff's proposed schedule (See Attached Copy of Power Point Presentation) to hold twelve work sessions and made the following comments:

  - Alternative suggestions were made that the work sessions be held on a different day, such as a Saturday morning or Friday night, in order to cover more substantial information in fewer sessions. In other words, the Commission wanted to find a way to abbreviate the schedule. There was some concern expressed about retaining the information from one section to the other with the work sessions spread out over such a long period of time.
  - One suggestion was made that the number of work sessions be reduced and the meeting time be lengthen in order to take care of more material during a shorter period of time, which would help them retain the information. The Commission asked that the work sessions be narrowed down to four to five sessions.
  - There was a concern with the schedule about holding it all together and making it work together.
  - The Commission asked that the July 3 meeting be cancelled.
  - The transportation presentation will be an important work session that will have a lot of public comment. The real meat is the existing conditions on transportation and future conditions, which is what the public will want to discuss and talk about most. The Commission suggested that be in a single work session.
  - The first 3 work sessions should be grouped together.
  - The Commission asked to look at the materials in larger chunks and to see where they are at with the North 29 Business Group.
  - The work session on transportation would be best if held at 4 p.m.
  - The Commission asked that the public comment sessions be held after Labor Day.
  - In response to the Commission's question about the scheduling, Mr. Benish noted that this study could not go on forever and they want to still have the consultants on hand to make these changes and get final draft back before the end of summer to look at the full document.
  - In response to a question raised about how the public could review the information, staff pointed out that the chapters would be available for the public to review on line, in the library and copies available at the County Office Building.
  - The Commission asked to schedule 1, 2, 3 and 4 together since they are background preparatory sessions in July. Staff can look for a Tuesday in July from 6 to 9 p.m. The Commission did not want to meet on July 3, but it could possibly be on July 17 or some other date staff found that was available.
  - The Commission suggested that 5 and 6 be scheduled on July 31 or as early as possible in August. Mr. Edgerton asked that August be avoided since so many people are on vacation.

Ms. Wiegand summarized the Commission's request for scheduling as follows:

- The first work session would include 1, 2, 3 and 4. The second would include 5 and 6. Then a public comment session would be held after that. Then 7 and 8 would be together. Then there would be a work session for discussion on the full plan after that with another work session held for public comment.

- The chapter discussions and the full plan discussions will be held from 5 to 9 p.m. on a particular Tuesday night, which staff will chose from the schedule. Staff needs to consult the calendar that has all of their items on it.

Mr. Cannon asked that staff keep reminding the Commission of the three crux points so that they could keep that focus as they go through the details.

Ms. Wiegand noted that the first 4 chapters would be scheduled for a work session in July. They may have to bump the rest of the work sessions up to September since they are not quite sure yet.

Mr. Strucko agreed to spread the work sessions out from July through October.

Mr. Morris agreed that having the work session on 5 and 6 in July, as staff suggested, would be great if possible. He noted that it was wonderful to hold the work sessions on Tuesday, but that there are other days, too.

Ms. Wiegand agreed that they would avoid August. She asked if there are other opportunities for public comment that the Commission would like staff to employ.

Mr. Edgerton noted that during the past year the Commission has opened up work sessions to take public comment. If he was hearing it correctly that in this process they would like not to open up discussion to the public except on these scheduled evenings.

Ms. Wiegand said that she would change that because when they first were proposing the schedule with the twelve work sessions they were looking at a very short period of time to go through them. So staff felt that on some evenings there would simply not be enough time for any serious public comment at the end. Therefore, staff was proposing to hold that until the public comment work sessions. But, the public was certainly free to sent things to us. But, if the Commission wants to hold a longer session then again they would still want the primary purpose of these to be an interaction between the Commission and the staff so that they can work through the plan and so that it is educational for the public so that they can hear what is going on and hear a description of what is in each chapter. But, if the Commission would like to have a period of time at the end of those for public comment staff would be very comfortable doing that.

Mr. Edgerton said that he would like to have a finite period of time. He would like to schedule it and make sure that the public knows that so that they can hopefully organize their comments and concerns. The public needs to be aware of this so that instead of ten people getting up and worrying about the same thing that maybe they could organize their concerns.

Mr. Morris agreed that was a good idea.

Ms. Wiegand noted that staff was happy to do that. She felt that the Commission has basically covered all of the questions. Staff has a good idea of what the Commission would like. Next week under old business staff will bring back the revised schedule.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that staff would need to make the Commission aware of the dates that they have found so that they can get it on their calendars. Staff understands generally where the Commission wants it to be and they will work with that.

Ms. Joseph noted that the chapters would be posted on the website. If the public has questions they can call staff and Planning Commission members. Therefore, they would get input that way also.

Ms. Wiegand asked that any input received be forwarded to staff so that they can keep records of it.

Ms. Catlin noted that the Board will be talking about this topic at their June 6 meeting. She passed out Places29 Public Participation Timeline, 2005 – present. (Attachment) The Board has gotten a request and is concerned about the speed at which this is moving and should it slow down. Staff would like to be able to tell them that their recommendation as the Planning Commission and as the Advisory Council is to go with the schedule that staff will be presenting to them on June 6. Staff will say that they have been

working as the Advisory Council on this project all along and that they feel comfortable with what is being proposed and where they are in terms of process with the project so far. She asked if that was a fair assumption to make. It is not to say that all content issues are resolved, but in terms of process moving along.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that they soften the message a little bit by saying they were under the impression that the two work sessions that have been scheduled out of consideration for the North Charlottesville Business Council by sticking to the schedule and consolidating it that those issues will be part of the discussion and will be addressed.

Ms. Catlin noted that the other thing that they want to talk about is the public participation process to date and what it has looked like. She wanted to share with the Commission the same material that staff will be presenting to the Board so that they were conversing in all of the many meetings, work sessions, presentations, etc. that have gone on over the past two years in case any concern comes to the Commission they will have the same level of information that they can share about what they have done to this point. The Board ultimately will have the opportunity to hopefully endorse the recommendation that staff will be making on the Commission's behalf about how the schedule will move forward from this point on.

Ms. Joseph said that it sounds good. She asked if there were any other questions for staff.

Mr. Morris thanked staff for their flexibility. They have put a lot of work in it and they change quickly.

Ms. Joseph noted that she had received a request from a member of the community to ask about whether or not the County had gotten a copy of the assessment for the property that Wendell Wood is selling to INJET. She guessed it had to do with whether they are placing land into the growth area.

Mr. Cilimberg said that he was not sure what that would mean to all of this.

Mr. Kamptner said that he thought she meant the appraisal of the property.

Mr. Benish replied that was not an issue for staff. He did not recall in our role in looking at that potential comprehensive plan amendment as part of Places29 they really have not focused in on the appraised value. They are looking at the land use merits of whether that area should be added to the development area or not.

Ms. Joseph said that staff was not looking at the costs.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that was a dangerous area to be getting in to when doing master planning work. Staff was directed through a resolution of intent of the Board to pursue certain things related to Places29 about consideration of areas. That is what they are doing.

Old Business:

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any old business.

- Regarding the request for ARB input for the Hollymead ZMA, Ms. Joseph asked if was appropriate to ask one member, all members as a joint work session or the rezoning hearing to discus their concern about the height of the buildings that are being proposed in the code of development.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the applicant was bringing back more information to them. The ARB will be making some recommendations that the Commission will get as part of their review. They may very well recommend not doing those kinds of buildings in the project. But, that would be part of what they would include in forwarding this to you.

Mr. Cannon asked if the ARB deliberation was continuing.

Mr. Cilimberg understood based on yesterday the applicant agreed to give the ARB some more information to consider. He assumed that the ARB would take it up at least one more time and have comments that they will forward on to the Commission, which would be incorporated in the information sent for the public hearing. Again, it is certainly appropriate for the ARB to have anyone attend and speak as well. The Commission could make sure that they have the opportunity to speak at that meeting or participate in whatever way they like, and then staff could let them know that.

Ms. Joseph noted that this was a phone call from Paul Wright in which he was very concerned about the height. She told him that she would bring this before the Commission to see what their thoughts were on that. If there is still another review for that, then the Commission will get more input from them.

Mr. Cannon said that it would be preferable to have it come through their process and the staff's summary of that process for our consideration.

- Last week the Commission discussed the new City Planning Commission's policy regarding not meeting with applicants prior to their meeting without having a staff member present. Several Commissioners expressed an interest to discuss pursuing this.

    - Several Commissioners asked that this topic be put on a future agenda for discussion. Staff should provide the Commission a copy of the actual resolution passed by the City to use in the discussion. Also, Greg Kamptner needs to be present.

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

New Business:

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any new business.

Mr. Edgerton passed out a flyer about a group of work shops that will be held about "Want to know why green matters" at The Habitat Store for free over the next few years. It might be something interesting to attend. (See Attachment)

- **Rivanna Village Master Plan Update** – David Benish

Mr. Benish provided a quick introduction on the Village of Rivanna Master Plan, which staff was beginning the master planning process on. He distributed a bulleted sheet of information dated May 22, 2007, of which he would go down and highlight the major points. (Attachment: Village of Rivanna Master Plan – Information for the Planning Commission dated May 22, 2007) This is mainly to let them know that they are beginning to engage in that work right now.

- Albemarle County has contracted with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission staff. They are going to begin work on the Village of Rivanna Master Plan.
- A Planning Academy is tentatively set for June 27 at the East Rivanna Fire Station. Rebecca Ragsdale will be the Planning project manager and Elaine Echols will be the lead supervisor on the project.
- Presentation of existing conditions and an early visioning session is planned for July. If an additional visioning session is needed, it will be scheduled for early September with more engaged work with the community.
- Staff expects to have two additional public meetings beyond the Planning Academy and that one beginning vision session in July.
- The schedule based on the scope of work is to have the Planning District complete that process in a product delivered to the Commission by next summer.
- As they fine tune the schedule in stepping through that process the Commission may be seeing information earlier during that year from time to time when staff needs guidance on processes. It will be a less formal role than the Places29 process because staff is not actually giving the Commission the designation as advisory council.

- The primary goal for today is to let the Commission know that next month staff will be out with the public beginning to engage them.
- Lee Catlin will be involved with the public process as well.

- **Pantops Master Plan** – David Benish

  - The first week in June staff will come back to the Commission with a revised draft. The primary changes they have reflected are that they are going to make adjustments that are more consistent with the master plan for Peter Jefferson Place. It somewhat downgrades the interconnectivity and the variety and form of development and better sort of balancing our vision with the realities of what their plan is. That is the direction that staff is working on in those changes.
  - They have given consideration to the Wheeler property and have had meetings with the property owner. They will probably be recommending leaving it in the plan, but staff has made notations that it is in an area that is eligible for deletion in the future consideration for taking it out of the development area. Therefore, there will be a record of the desire and interest to meet certain resource needs to take that out. But, as of right now it will come back as being proposed to stay in with those caveats. The Commission has a decision to make in the plan that they would recommend for that area. That will be coming back.
  - They are endeavoring to try to be a little more forceful in some of the recommendations on community facilities. But, again keep in mind that those facility recommendations in some ways run counter to the long range planning for some of those facilities county wide. Therefore, staff is trying to balance that.

- **Eastern Connector Meetings**

  - Mr. Morris noted that they were now an hour into the first public session for the Eastern Connector being held at Broadus Memorial Baptist Church on Route 20 North. It will go until 9:00 p.m. tonight. A repeat will be held at Southern land Middle School on Thursday starting at 6:30 p.m.

- **Possible 4:00 p.m. Work Session on June 19**

  - Mr. Benish noted that on June 19 there were some weighty items that might take some time. There is at least one work session on a rezoning. Staff might like the option to schedule a 4:00 p.m. work session to lighten the evening agenda. If that is not doable staff needs to know that so that they can massage the schedule. It might not be necessary since they have has two items drop off that meeting today. But, staff would still like to get some guidance in case they need to go for a 4:00 p.m. work session on June 19.

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m. to the Tuesday, May 29, 2007 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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