Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 29, 2008

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and public hearing on Tuesday, April 29, 2008, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Marcia Joseph, Bill Edgerton, Eric Strucko, Thomas Loach, Linda Porterfield, Jon Cannon, Vice-Chairman and Calvin Morris, Chairman. Ms. Joseph arrived at 6:03 p.m. Julia Monteith, AICP, non-voting representative for the University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Glenn Brooks, County Engineer; Lisa Glass, Principal Planner; Judith Wiegand, Senior Planner; Susan Stimart, Business Development Facilitator; Juan Wade, Transportation Planner; Bill Fritz, Chief of Current Development; Patrick Lawrence, Planner and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris called the regular meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

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

Public Hearing Item:

SP-2007-00056 Rivanna Plaza (Sign # 55)
PROPOSED: Drive thru lane for proposed retail building
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: Highway Commercial (HC); EC Entrance Corridor Overlay
SECTION: 24.2.2(13) Special Use Permit, which allows for drive-in windows serving or associated with permitted uses.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE: Regional Service in Urban Area 1
LOCATION: Tax Map Parcel 45-109 and 45-112C1, located on northwest side of Seminole Trail (Rte. 29) Approximately 1,100 north of Woodbrook Drive
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rio
CONCURRENT PROJECT: SDP200700137
(Lisa Glass)

Mr. Fritz presented a power-point presentation and summarized the staff report. (See Staff Report)

This is a special use permit request. There is a site plan associated with it. The only thing that is before the Planning Commission is the special use permit. The site plan will be done administratively after the Board of Supervisors act on the special use permit.

The proposal is for a project located on Route 29 in front of the Kegler's Bowling Alley and just south of Schewel's. The proposal is for three buildings and a drive through:

- 12,500 square foot daycare center,
- 14,800 square foot retail structure, and
- 5,000 square foot retail structure.

This project proposes to close the existing access road to Kegler's and to realign and reorient the Schewel's parking lot. Currently the Schewel's parking lot has an entrance onto Route 29 and it accesses what will ultimately become the Berkmar 29 Connector. It closes that connection off to the Berkmar 29 Connection, which was strongly recommended by VDOT because that intersection is too close to the Route 29 intersection. Now what will happen is that this Schewel's parking lot will access the new access road that will go into Rivanna Plaza that also goes up to serve the Kegler's facility, which has

a connection that gets back to the Berkmar 29 Connector Road in a much more optimal location. It does not present any conflicts with either the Route 29 or Berkmar intersections. It actually gets it away from the intersection. There is really no other place to get a connection because of the location of existing Schewel's building. So it does have a connection back to the Berkmar 29 Connector.

All of the transportation impacts have reviewed with the Department of Transportation and in light of the Places29 Study that currently underway. This is consistent with the recommendations of VDOT and the Places29 review. The interior circulation is also been looked at to ensure that the circulation of the drive through functions properly. It is staff's recommendation that it does. Staff's opinion is that approval of this special use permit will not have a negative affect on transportation and it is consistent with the character of the area. The Architectural Review Board recently reviewed this particular request and made recommendations that the applicant has agreed to provide an increased planting area.

The only negative factor staff cited in the review of the special use permit was that they did not have comment from the Architectural Review Board. With the favorable comment from the Architectural Review Board staff has no negative comments. Staff recommends approval of the special use permit subject to two conditions as recommended.

Mr. Morris asked if there were questions for staff.

Ms. Porterfield asked if where it was going to open up on Route 29 it would be a right-in and a right-out.

Mr. Fritz replied yes because it was not at a cross-over. To utilize it they would have to go out to the signalized intersection or go down Route 29 to get to the signal at Lowe's.

Ms. Joseph asked if an easement had been received from the Kegler's property to do this.

Mr. Fritz replied yes that the applicant has been working with Kegler's and Schewel's to coordinate all of this.

Ms. Joseph asked if that would be a requirement for the final site plan, and Mr. Fritz replied that it was part of this site plan.

Mr. Edgerson asked if it would include a connection that would go all the way across the Kegler's property up to Berkmar Drive.

Mr. Fritz replied yes that the road would go all the way up through. The new entrance they will construct will tie into the Kegler's development, which is already there. It goes up through and then there will be a new connection constructed that will get to the Berkmar 29 Connector road. They are not going to be constructing the Berkmar 29 Connector. The road goes up to this point now. There was another project that was before the Commission that would improve it and build it through to Berkmar. This project would get it out to Route 29, but not to Berkmar at this time.

Mr. Edgerton noted that he was confused. The road that is shown on the site plan that goes up to the Kegler's property is going into an existing parking lot. He asked if there will be an easement across that parking lot that will continue up all the way to Berkmar.

Mr. Fritz replied that it would not be to Berkmar, but to the connection that will get them to what will ultimately be the Berkmar 29 Connector.

Mr. Edgerton said going back to the Commission saw a couple weeks ago with Frank Stoner's group that was going to come down. Now the connection that the Commission was hoping for will be a zig zag to 29.

Mr. Fritz said that ultimately the Berkmar 29 Connector road will go down through this area because it needs to get to the traffic signal.

Mr. Edgerton said that they were still talking about another entrance onto 29 in the future. He asked the width of Schewel's frontage.

Mr. Fritz noted that it was roughly 230'.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there is no concern form VDOT about the how close those two access points are.

Mr. Fritz said that VDOT has reviewed the proposal and he confirmed with them when he received the emails from several Commissioners that entrance meets with their standards. VDOT can support this request.

Mr. Cilimberg said that one of the things that has transpired here is that to VDOT the preferably change is the removal of the Schewel's entrance, which is almost immediately at the 29 intersection. It is literally just a few feet off that intersection. By removing it and getting it several hundred feet back up the Berkmar 29 Connector they think that is a positive even though they get this 200' plus along 29 separation.

Mr. Edgerton said that they still have the issue on the north side of that proposed connection.

Mr. Cilimberg said that this is accompanying one-half of what ultimately needs to happen. The other part is on a property that is not under review at all.

Mr. Cannon said that these changes, which are associated with a by-right use, are consistent with the construction of the Berkmar 29 Connector as they currently visualize it and, in fact, would facilitate that. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Fritz said that it would significantly improve it because of the intersection problem that it solves at Route 29.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it facilitates it on the Schewel's side. But, as remembered from the rezoning the problem is Better Living and getting them to agree to changes that would facilitate it on their side.

Mr. Cannon asked if does not worsen that situation, and Mr. Cilimberg replied no.

Mr. Fritz noted that he asked that question specifically of VDOT and that was their statement.

Ms. Porterfield said that until they build the piece that is going around Schewel's how are cars going to get out of this parking lot if they want to go north.

Mr. Fritz replied that it was all part of the same project. It would be a right out. If someone did not want to take advantage of the back connection through Schewel's and wanted to go northbound they would have to turn right and head south on Route 29, go to the signalized intersection at Woodbrook and make a U-turn at the Woodbrook intersection.

Ms. Porterfield asked if they were going to have this applicant help out with the Berkmar Connector.

Mr. Fritz replied that other than the redesign of the Schewel's entrance, which is a significant improvement and one they have been seeking for quite some time, there is nothing the applicant is doing with the Berkmar 29 connection.

Ms. Porterfield said that the other applicant is basically still stuck.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that is still to be decided by the Board as to what they are going to require.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff is going to be giving the Board information regarding this project prior to their deciding what to do about the Berkmar situation.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that staff would provide the part of what they need to make the Board aware of. He noted that the other request had been deferred and was not going to be heard in May.

Ms. Porterfield noted that, in her opinion, that the problem on Route 29 was what hung up the Commission's vote on it. It is not the other applicant's fault because they can't do anything about what Better Living is going to do. But, now this other applicant can get back out that way and are going to be bringing cars into that intersection.

Mr. Strucko said that right now the only entrance into this proposed development is the proposed new right-in and right-out entrance only.

Mr. Fritz said that the road behind Schewel's is there.

Mr. Strucko asked if that was a potential second access point to this proposed development.

Mr. Fritz noted that it will not get them to Berkmar, but it would get them back down on to Route 29.

Mr. Strucko asked if would be the right-in and right-out entrance off of Route 29 and then they could work their way through parking lot and come out right where the arrow was located.

Mr. Fritz said that there are two options, which included going up and around to get the signalized intersection.

Mr. Strucko asked what the proposed use was of the building that is requiring the drive through window.

Mr. Fritz replied that it was up to the applicant. It was submitted as specialty retail. Whenever they do that staff views the drive through as the most intense drive through use, which is a fast food restaurant. It could be used for a fast food restaurant or a pharmacy drive through. Staff uses the highest volume generator.

Ms. Joseph said that they are looking at this as a special use permit for the drive through window. What staff has done with their analysis with engineering and everyone else is that they have looked at where the headlights are going to be pointing and the stacking. She asked if staff has found that this complies with the requirements for everything they have looked at in the past.

Mr. Fritz agreed that staff has reviewed the stacking, the by-pass lanes, the Architectural Review Board and the on-site circulation, as well as making sure they have the support from the Department of Transportation for to the overall traffic impacts.

Ms. Joseph said that the Architectural Review has no problem with the configuration of this. The ARB will be looking at the façade of the building obviously. But, the ARB has been looking for additional plantings. The area that the applicant has shown provides enough space for additional plantings.

Mr. Fritz replied yes, but that since he had not reviewed it they were not presenting it to the Commission. But, the applicant has already drafted a plan that addresses the ARB's concerns.

Mr. Strucko said that the drive through window is going to generate a certain type of traffic flow in and out of this proposal. Northbound traffic will have to the signalized light, turn left and go past Schewel's and go up to the connection with the potential Berkmar Connector to access this drive through window or do a U-turn, double back and turn right into the main entrance. Or, they could make a U-turn at the signalized light and then turn right.

Mr. Fritz agreed that those were the two options.

Mr. Strucko said that if he wanted to leave and go north he would have to go up past Schewel's, down the Berkmar Connector to the signalized light to make a left to head to 29 North.

Mr. Fritz noted or to head southbound on 29 to the Woodbrook intersection and do a U-turn there.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that in some ways it was a bit like the turning movements only headed in the opposite direction associated with Taco Bell and the bank where Pier One is located at the Gardens Shopping Center. There is no cross over for their entrance either. They have to go down to the Albemarle Square light and either do a U-turn to come back and go into that development to go through those drive through windows or go through the shopping center parking lot at Albemarle Square.

Mr. Strucko said that this particular applicant for a drive through window is causing a unique traffic pattern in this particular development. That unique traffic pattern may very well utilize the road going past Schewel's up to the Berkmar Connector.

Mr. Fritz suggested saying they are generating increased traffic instead of causing a unique traffic pattern. If this development did not have a drive through it would still have this configuration.

Mr. Strucko noted but not necessarily the traffic pattern.

Mr. Fritz said that it would have the same traffic pattern, but it would be a different volume because drive through windows has higher traffic volume.

Mr. Strucko asked if there are any improvements needed for the Berkmar Connector Road from 29 to the top of the Schewel's development.

Mr. Fritz noted that it would be a recommendation by the engineering staff or VDOT to do that.

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

Mark Green, for Rivanna Plaza LLC, said they support the recommendation of the staff and are pleased to come to the Commission with a unanimous recommendation from the Architectural Review Board. He was present to answer questions.

Mr. Strucko asked if the applicant has determined the use of the facility that would require a drive through window.

Mr. Green replied that they were negotiating with a coffee shop.

Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed to bring the matter before the Commission for action.

Ms. Joseph asked if the Board would see Berkmar Business Park and this item at the same time.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that Berkmar Business Park has been deferred to June. This item is going to the Board on June 11. They may end up on the same meeting. This item might be ahead of Berkmar Business Park depending on whether there is further deferral with that. They had a fair amount of items to address following the Commission's action. That was not easy for them to complete for the May hearing. Therefore, they have asked for a deferral to June. So there timing is going to be roughly the same at this point.

Ms. Joseph said that this request shows some real positive improvements along Route 29 because they were getting rid of some entrances. Schewel's currently has two entrances and now they will share that entrance. Also, the existing entrance to Kegler's is going away. Therefore, she could see some positive effects of this site plan that would probably be happening without the request for the special use permit. She felt that it was important for the Board to know what is going on in this area. She felt that the straight connector road was extremely important down to Berkmar. She supported the request with the conditions made by staff.

Mr. Morris said that this has the added advantage of providing a connector prior to that very steep slope on the side of Schewel's. It has a lot of advantages.

Mr. Cannon said that this was a by-right development other than the drive through window. He felt that the applicant has worked with staff and VDOT to take steps to improve conditions and facilitate their ultimate goal, which is a functioning connector road. He felt that this was a good step forward and supported it.

Ms. Porterfield agreed with Ms. Joseph that the Berkmar Connector is a very important item. She was concerned that when they looked at it that they were asking the applicant to do something that he had no control over. The applicant in that case has no way of doing something with Better Living. This applicant is now going to put a great deal of traffic onto that entrance on what would be the lower part of Berkmar if it ever comes all the way through. She was concerned about that, which was why she asked the question whether this applicant was going to help with the Berkmar Connector. It is going to benefit this applicant to be able to get their traffic out to a stop light where they don't have to make U-turns. She wanted to make sure the Board was aware of both requests before taking an action.

Mr. Morris asked staff to write in the executive summary that this is coming to the Board. He said that this was an excellent time for the Commissioners to contact their individual Supervisor to alert them.

Motion: Ms. Joseph moved, Mr. Cannon seconded, for approval of SP-2007-00056, Rivanna Plaza with the conditions as recommended by staff.

1. Drive-in window is limited to one window.
2. Development of the site will be in general accord with the site plan titled Special Use Permit Application Plan for Rivanna Plaza and initialed.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris stated that SP-2007-00056, Rivanna Plaza will go before the Board of Supervisors on June 11 with a recommendation for approval.

Work Sessions:

SP-2007-00053 St. Anne's Belfield-New Academic Bldg
PROPOSED: to increase the number of students from 300 to 550 by adding new buildings and demolishing some existing buildings. No residential units are proposed.
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: R-1 Residential (1 unit/acre).
SECTION: 13.2.2.5, which allows private schools by Special Use Permit.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Institutional - schools, universities and colleges and ancillary facilities and public facilities and utilities in Neighborhood 7.
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes X
LOCATION: 720 Faulconer Drive (Rt.855), Charlottesville, VA 22903, approximately 1620 feet from the intersection of Faulconer Drive and the Ivy Road/Rt 250 off ramp from the 250 Bypass.
TAX MAP/PARCEL: TM 60 Parcels 57, 57A, 57B, 57C.
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Jack Jouett

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on SP-2007-00053, St. Anne's-Belfield – New Academic Building for staff to receive guidance on the historic structure (the Head Master's Dwelling), on possible offsite road improvements to offset impacts on the transportation system, and any other expectations before the public hearing was set.

Ms. Wiegand presented a power-point presentation and reviewed the proposal. (Attachment – power-point presentation) She pointed out the following:

- Yesterday afternoon, which was after the preparation of the staff report, staff found that the applicant has contacted an architectural historian and has had a report prepared on the Head Master's dwelling. Staff received the report at tonight's meeting and has not reviewed the report. Staff will include the results of the study in the analysis of the staff report for the public hearing.
- The traffic impact analysis that was done analyzed five intersections to determine the impact of the increased traffic on those intersections. There is still some missing information. Some of the

traffic report information was basically percentages and estimates. Staff has not yet obtained from the school the information containing the real numbers needed to do the analysis. The County Engineer is present and can explain in detail what information staff is looking for. If the finalized traffic impact analysis shows that expansion of the school will increase traffic at intersections in the area should the school be requested to make improvements to one or more of these intersections as recommended by the County Engineer and VDOT. She noted that these intersections in 2010, which is the year that the expansion of the school is projected to open, the background traffic before adding the school's traffic these intersections are already struggling. The school will add something to that, but will not be the entire cause of the problem. But, at the same time they are adding traffic to an existing bad situation. That is why VDOT and County staff would like to see them make an improvement. She asked if the Planning Commission feels that is appropriate. She invited the County Engineer, Glenn Brooks, to address the issue.

Glenn Brooks, County Engineer, noted that there are three other intersections in that vicinity that deal with the on and off ramps for 29. VDOT has asked for those three intersections to be studied. He noted that the merge lanes are very short and mostly inadequate. It is not real clear as to what improvements could take place at these intersections. If he was doing it he might move Faulconer Drive and not have an intersection in the middle of an interstate ramp.

Mr. Strucko asked where he would relocate the ramp.

Mr. Brooks replied that the ramp might be placed down on Garth Road. That would reduce the conflicts considerably. There are things that could be done to the intersections themselves, too, to improve things. But, the studies received from the applicant basically said that they don't want to do anything since they don't feel that they are responsible for that. A few of those intersections have very large volumes and they are a small percentage. But, that is a decision that has to be made. The other thing that affected the traffic numbers received was some very large assumptions. Usually when looking at a traffic study staff sees assumptions for different modes of transit or car pooling, etc. in the range of five percent. This study used 30 percent as a reduction number. They were citing the basic experience of the staff about the number of people that carpool and perhaps on the number of students and how many siblings are at the school. The study needs to have real data taken from a traffic count. Staff raised a red flag when they saw a number as high as 30 percent. Those are the main concerns with the traffic study. Staff's recommendation is that they study the intersections suggested by VDOT and decide on what improvements, if any, the school is willing to do based on the working of the intersections to come to some agreement.

Mr. Edgerton said that he was curious about the 300 students at the pre-school versus taking it up to 550 students. When they have an athletic event in the afternoon and most of the children are coming down from the existing middle school or upper school to this campus that is a tremendous traffic impact already. He was curious whether that is being factored in on this study.

Mr. Brooks replied that it was not included in this study.

Mr. Edgerton asked if the 300 was based on the number of students that are currently going to class on the lower school campus or does that 300 include the additional serge of traffic that is already using Faulconer Drive.

Ms. Wiegand replied that staff is not sure what they are counting in the 300 student number or if the athletic events were considered.

Mr. Edgerton said that the school use to have buses running to carry the students from the upper school campus to the lower school campus. That would affect dramatically the amount of traffic. The athletic events are when so much of the extended family of these students is using these same intersections and roads. He wondered if by moving the middle school that they are certainly going to have a little more traffic. He wondered if it would be as dramatic a change as from 300 to 500 students.

Mr. Brooks said that they have suggested that moving the middle school campus will perhaps improve some of the movements and the ramp intersections that currently go to the lower school in the city and

would now go the other direction to the lower school in the county. But, that is a hypothesis. He said that he did not know whether the school would continue to use the other property.

Mr. Strucko asked if there were any dormitories on this particular campus.

Ms. Wiegand noted that they would have to ask the applicant.

Mr. Strucko assumed that the additional 120 students would be commuters and will be dropped off in the morning and picked up at night.

Ms. Wiegand replied yes, that is what staff was told. The car pooling idea is that parents of students in the upper and lower school would bring both students at the same time. The applicant has also talked about trying to avoid all of the traffic coming in at the same time by staggering the opening and dismissal hours for the school. Staff's concern is that if they have a middle school student who is suppose to arrive at 8:00 and an elementary school student that is suppose to arrive at 8:30 are the parents really going to drop them off at the same time. Again, there are a lot of questions staff has not been able to get answered in the traffic study yet.

Mr. Loach asked what the level of service is on these intersections on 250 right now. He noted that in the morning coming in to town traffic is backed up all the way past Broomley Road on 250 going up to the nursery and further back. He questioned if there are any expectations. The Board has approved over 3,000 homes in Crozet.

Mr. Brooks said that it depends on which year chosen. He asked what the build out year was.

Ms. Wiegand noted that the school was scheduled to open in 2010, which was being used as the background.

Mr. Brooks said that he would have to look it up. But, typically the intersections on Old Ivy Road are operating around a level "C" or "D" and that kind of projected build out. He did not know the particulars and suggested that their traffic engineer could answer that.

Mr. Loach agreed that 30 percent car pooling is asking a lot to believe because the current traffic is horrendous.

Mr. Edgerton asked what the status was of the traffic study.

Ms. Wiegand replied that the traffic study is not final.

Mr. Loach asked what the conclusions on the study received.

Mr. Brooks said that looking at the background traffic for 2010, which are the movements he is probably referencing, and the left turns off of 250 are already failing. The question in a study like this is how much is the delay increasing that is attributed to the increase they would be authorizing with the additional students. Regarding the conclusion, the school has basically not proposed any improvements. The school recognizes that some of these intersections are having problems, but it is not completely contributable to the school. Therefore, they don't feel they should do improvements.

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

David Laurie, Head of St. Anne's Belfield School, introduced the members of their team as Hulbert Bowie, lead architect; Scott Dunn, who has conducted the traffic study; Kurt Gloeckner, the engineer; Mike Wayland, Assistant Head of St. Anne's Belfield School. Their plan is construct a kindergarten through eighth grade academic complex on the lower campus. They have their preschoolers through fourth graders on that campus in a building almost 60 years old. This replacement has been in their master plan for years. They are not increasing their overall student enrollment. The lower school will stay the same number. The middle school moving to this campus will stay the same number. The upper school will also stay the same number. All of the boarding students are on the upper campus. So there will be no

boarding students on the lower campus. They commissioned a study on the Head Master's house. The top three points is that it is not architecturally distinguished or unusual. It does not meet any criteria for a listing on the national historic register of historic places. It is not in a historic district.

Hulbert Bowie, of Bowie Gridley Architects, said that they are the master planners working with the school to prepare the long range master plan for the facilities looking at both campuses. He presented a power-point presentation to explain the proposal. He noted that all of the traffic that comes to this campus comes from Faulconer Drive. As a planner for a facility like this the most important thing is that there are lots of options. They can manage this site in a number of ways because of the amount of roads and the ring road that circles the whole property.

Scott Dunn, with Timmons Group, said that he did the traffic study. He asked to address the 30 percent reduction. It is not hypothetical. Information was provided from the school headmaster based on the number of children attending both schools and the overlap between siblings. There are 199 families in the lower and 182 in the relocating middle school. Of those sects there are 53 families that have kids in both schools. Those numbers are based on real numbers and current population. The school is making accommodations to take students that arrive early to accommodate them for one-half an hour until their school starts. There is a half hour difference between middle school and lower school. He said that people are going to make one trip and minimize the impact to their time and wallet. When they did the study the school, if one looks at total numbers of 250 students, they generate 220 a.m. peak hour trips based on the private school trip generation. That number does not meet VDOT's current standards for a traffic study, which the county is currently following. So the study should not have been done or under the guidance of VDOT. Beyond that a study was performed up the road for the White Gables and they looked at their intersection/entrance and nothing else. There was the same amount of trips in the a.m. and p.m. There were no additional intersections reviewed for that. All of this said there are problems out there that he would not deny. The reason that improvements were not recommended was that there are right-of-way constraints and topography constraints. He felt that those were beyond the means of the school to have to burden or shoulder.

Mr. Strucko asked how many additional daily vehicle trips are the additional 250 students going to create.

Mr. Dunn replied that unfortunately the IT Manual they use does not provide daily trips. It just provides peak hour. If they look at straight numbers during peak hours, it is 220 in the morning total and 150 in the afternoon total. With the reduction of the 30 percent it took them down to 150 in the morning and 110 in the afternoon. The numbers include the staff and faculty.

Mr. Strucko said that there were 260 additional daily vehicle trips with the 30 percent reduction.

Mr. Dunn replied yes, that the two peak hours with a school account for about 80 percent of their daily traffic. It would be about 500 trips or so a day. The existing middle school is located to the east in the city and it is moving to the west. Again, these trips are not new on this road. Obviously, some are shifting to Old Ivy Road. He said that he would not portray that the traffic will instantly get better on 29 because of this. But, the impacts are minimal to this school.

Mr. Strucko said that the impacts will be on Faulconer Drive.

Mr. Dunn agreed that the impacts would be on Faulconer Drive. In the study they identified that on the 29 off ramp there should be a left and right turn lane southbound on the ramp itself at Old Garth Road. He noted that currently traffic backs up on that ramp waiting for cars to turn left on to Old Ivy Road. That is an existing condition. That condition is going to get worse with or without their school.

Mr. Strucko said that it will certainly get worse with the addition of these.

Mr. Dunn agreed, but mentioned that the p.m. peak is worse in that area and does not overlap with the p.m. peak of the existing road. The p.m. peak of the existing road is between 4:30 and 5:30 p.m. The school will be letting out at 3:30 p.m. So there is some separation between the peaks. The a.m. is worse because schools let in when people are going to work. There are needed intersection improvements at Old Garth and the ramp. They identified that there should be a turn lane on Faulconer Drive exiting the

site on to the ramp to accommodate right turning traffic. The reason they did not recommend that is the site distance issue. People fly off the interchange ramp and he thought that it was an unsafe condition to add an additional turn lane and block right turning vehicles point of view of that ramp and the other car in front of it. It is just an accident waiting to happen. That was one of the recommendations. The other improvement related to the school was a right turn tamper on Old Ivy Road heading west bound on Faulconer Drive. That warrant was minimally met by VDOT standard normal graphs. The level of service does not change if that improvement is added in. The reason they did not include it was that in the field that is a drainage inlet in that corner. If a turn taper was put in it would likely affect the drainage system that is there, which could be a huge expense for an improvement that would not make any difference in the level of service.

Mr. Edgerton asked if all the land between the school and Old Garth Road is owned by the University.

Ms. Wiegand said that it was owned by the University Foundation.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there has been any discussion with them about trying to relocate Faulconer Drive across any of that land.

Dave Laurie noted that they have not had conversations about Faulconer Drive, but they don't seem willing to part with their land.

Mr. Dunn said that the county engineer has requested that the additional work, which may or may not be outstanding depending on what is decided tonight, is the study of the 250 by pass interchange for the school. VDOT and the county have indicated that they wanted the school to collect data and look at the intersections and the interchange for impacts related to the school both on 250/Ivy Road and Old Ivy Road at the 29 north on ramp. He questioned whether the Commission felt it was necessary to undertake. Given the trip generation they are looking at they have prepared the numbers for the school versus what is out there and it is 2 to 2.5 percent of the existing traffic that they are adding to it if they look at straight numbers. Basically, it was less than 30 vehicles they were adding to the interchange. He was not sure what kind of improvements would be extracted and necessary through an interchange to accommodate 30 vehicles. It is an already failing situation. The intersection at the on ramp at Old Ivy Road was requested to be studied. They looked at the numbers they collected at the intersection of Old Ivy Road and Faulconer Drive. There are no intersections between those two locations. They looked at the number of cars coming into and exiting the intersection to get an idea of the through traffic on Old Ivy road. Based on those calculations the existing background traffic in 2010 will warrant a 100' left turn lane on to the on ramp. That being said, given the overpass there today there is no room to put one in short of doing a major bridge improvement over the interstate.

Kirk Gloeckner, of Gloeckner Engineering, said that most of the work he would do would be underground pipes for water and sewer and storm water management. He talked with a member of VDOT today. Along the by pass is a chain link fence that belongs to VDOT. They said that with a permit they can plant that fence as thick as they like with English Ivy or some plant that would completely cut off any vision into this project. That just came about today. With the demolition of the existing school the impervious area that is there now drains mostly towards the by pass. With the creation of a new play field in that area the run off towards the by pass will be cut to one third of what it is right now. The other hard cape parking and what have you will all be directed to the back of the school to an existing practice field, which has a sand filter underneath that does the clean up of the storm water. There is also a huge under ground pipe that takes care of the detention. The practice field itself also handles some of the detention. The amount of impervious material that is created between what is demolished and what is built is only .2 of an acre because there is a lot of existing pavement in basketball, etc. on the existing site. They are connected to public waste and sewer. There are three existing fire hydrants and there will be four. With the new construction there will be a sprinkler system and fire pumps in the mechanical room that has a support generation. So the pump station and the fire pump will have auxiliary power for when they lose it on site.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Paul Urb said that he was one of the two neighbors on the west side of the property. He did not think that the damage to the property would be significant with this move. There is a great deal of traffic in the

afternoon. The base field is often traveled to by people not at the school. He understood that at one time the University of Virginia had acquired the right to build a tunnel. If that area going to the John Paul Jones Arena were developed there was some other proposal to clean up that intersection that the University at one time had an interest in. The Foundation had acquired that property. Under those conditions it seemed that there was promise for the future and not much damage at the present.

There being no further public comments, Mr. Morris closed the public hearing to bring the matter before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Joseph asked if Mr. Wade would like to add anything to the discussion.

Juan Wade, Transportation Planner, replied no that Mr. Brooks has reflected their comments. They realize that overall this project is not going to have a tremendous impact on the traffic in the area because of the amount of traffic. But, they would like to get a fair share of the impact of this project on the roadway network. They realize that whatever that number will be they will work with the county and VDOT to establish that number. It may be small, but they are in the position now that they don't have a lot of funds to get transportation projects done. There have been improvements identified in the traffic study that are already needed without this project. They need to start putting some money aside to get those things done. They will work with the applicant to make sure the numbers are correct and identify their fair share of the impact of their project.

Ms. Joseph asked Mr. Wade if he knew anything about the tunnel Mr. Urb referred to.

Mr. Wade replied that every year there is a class at UVA that studies this project. That is one of their proposals, but he has never heard it was an official project.

Ms. Porterfield asked if they ask the applicant to contribute if they are we asking them to study too big of an area.

Mr. Wade replied that the reason they asked them to study this area is the close proximity to these ramps. He was comfortable with the scope of the study. VDOT and the county will take the additional information and review it.

The Commission reviewed, discussed and provided comments and suggestions to staff's questions, as follows:

- **Should the school conduct an evaluation before the Commission and Board act on the special use permit to determine which option is preferable?** Since preparation of the staff report for this work session the applicant has submitted a report on the Head Master's dwelling which addresses the staff's first question. The Commission agreed to review the staff's findings regarding this report as part of the public hearing on this special use permit.
- **If the finalized TIA shows the expansion of the school will increase traffic at intersections in the area, should the school be requested to make improvements to one or more of those intersections, as recommended by the County Engineer and VDOT?** Regarding traffic impacts, since the school will add to the existing problem at several area intersections, the Commission questioned what the school's proportional share should be towards improvements that address that impact. The Commission asked the applicant to provide the missing information in its traffic study so this could be determined. The Commission asked staff to work with VDOT and the applicant to determine the school's impact on the intersections and to determine what the applicant's pro-rata contribution should be to address the impact of this project on the road network.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:37 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:49 p.m.

Economic Development (CPA)

An update to the Economic Development Policy - an element of the Comprehensive Plan

(David Benish/Susan Stimart)

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on the Economic Development Policy, 2007 Data Update. Susan Stimart presented a power-point presentation and update of economic data to be utilized in future discussion and revision of the Economic Development Policy. The Planning Commission held a discussion and provided comments and suggestions. No formal action was taken. Public comment was taken.

- Brian Wheeler, of Charlottesville Tomorrow, asked staff to provide additional information on the history of the Light Industrial property in the county on the rezonings and comp plan amendments that have taken place.

The Planning Commission provided the following comments and suggestions in order to move forward in the next work session and develop strategies to bring forth solutions for the proposed strategies:

- The Light Industrial definition needs to be looked at very hard to determine possible conflicts and why it is being used for other types of uses.

- Several Commissioners suggested that in #1, Increasing LI land for local business expansion should add "in the development area." (One Commissioner disagreed that potential areas for LI should be limited to only development areas. The Commissioner suggested that consideration be given to areas abutting development areas and/or areas with good vehicular access from various parts of the county.)

- (One Commissioner disagreed that it should not be limited to the development area.)

- The users of Light Industrial land are not able to pay the high cost of LI land.

- Staff was asked to come back and talk about the current demand and how it could be accommodated in the growth area and how it matches up for further discussion. Also, antidotal information on who is coming in and contacting staff would be helpful.

Old Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business.

The Commission asked that staff provide information and clarify the question raised by Mr. Edgerton about the building site designation on the Bonner plat reviewed last week. The question was raised concerning the interpretation of the building site in that there is not enough area demonstrated for the 30,000 square feet required. There was some interest expressed in pursuing a zoning text amendment due to the concern that easements for the benefit for adjacent property owners could have a significant impact on the availability of land for development of the building site.

Mr. Strucko left the meeting at 8:34 p.m.

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

New Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the Board's discussion on use valuation will be on May 14 at 3:30 p.m. The joint meeting of the ARB, PC and Board will be held on May 21 at 1:30 p.m. Staff is working on the agenda for the meeting.

Committee Reports:

- Ms. Porterfield reported that the Historic Preservation Committee met yesterday. A proclamation will be done by the Board of Supervisors on May 12 recognizing Historic Preservation month. The Board is advertising for new members. She asked that the Planning Commissioners encourage anyone they might think was qualified and interested in the committee to obtain an application form, which is available on the county website.

- Ms. Joseph reported that Mr. Morris and she had attended a meeting at Fontana on the presentation of the Pantops Master Plan. It was very informational. The Fontana residents were very supportive and appreciative of Glenn Brooks for his assistance.

- Ms. Joseph noted that VDOT is working on new traffic modeling that should be up and running by the end of year. She suggested that it might be helpful to the Commission on something like St. Anne's review.

- Ms. Joseph noted that she would be absent next week.

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

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m. to the Tuesday, May 6, 2008 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)