Albemarle County Planning Commission
July 26, 2011

A regular meeting of the Albemarle County Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, July 26, 2011, at 6:00 p.m., Room #241, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Russell (Mac) Lafferty, Duane Zobrist, Chair; Ed Smith, Linda Porterfield, Don Franco and Calvin Morris, Vice Chair. Commissioners absent was Thomas Loach. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia, was present.

Other officials present were Gerald Gatobu, Principal Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Community Development; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Zobrist, Chairman, called the regular meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. and established a quorum.

Matters from the Public not Listed on the Agenda:

Mr. Zobrist invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda.

Neil Williamson, Free Enterprise Forum, spoke regarding the upcoming joint meeting of the Planning Commission, Architectural Review Board, and Board of Supervisors. He expressed the hope that it would be a productive session that seriously addresses how applications move through the County process and what the best method is for getting them through the process.

There being no further comments, the meeting proceeded to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – June 13, 2011

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on June 13, 2011.

Consent Agenda:

a. Approval of minutes: October 19, 2010 & February 17, 2011

b. HO-2011-00142 Day Song Studio Home Occupation Class A
The request is for a modification to a Home Occupation Class A to increase the number of customers/students from 7 per week to 20 per week for an existing music studio (vocal/piano teacher) in accordance with Section 5.2.2.1.D of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is zoned PUD. (David Benish)

Mr. Zobrist asked if any Commissioner would like to pull an item from the consent agenda for further review.

Ms. Porterfield noted the action taken on HO-2011-00142 Day Song Studio Home Occupation Class A should be subject to the conditions recommended by staff. She suggested condition #3 be modified so not to include a family that might be bringing a couple of kids for piano lessons in the same car. It would be one trip for the parent. She would like this piano teacher to be able to do that. Both she and her brother were dropped off at the same time for piano lessons. She would like the last condition not to apply to families who are coming in the same car.

Mr. Benish replied that he felt that was fine since the applicant indicated they would not be doing large group sessions. Group sessions are covered by other components of the operation of home occupations. Therefore, it would be okay to delete condition #3 that no more than one client per session; no group sessions.

Ms. Porterfield supported approval of HO-2011-142 based on the deletion of condition #3.

Motion: Ms. Porterfield moved and Mr. Morris seconded for approval of the Consent Agenda as presented with one modification to HO-2011-00142 Day Song Studio Home Occupation Class A with the deletion of condition #3 .

1. Clients may only be on the property between 8:30 a.m. and 7:30 p.m.;
2. No more than 20 clients per week (Monday through Saturday).

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of (6:0).

Mr. Zobrist said the consent agenda was approved.

Public Hearing Item:

SP-2011-00004 Eagleburger Property AT&T CV352 Tier III PWSF
PROPOSED: A one hundred and fifty five (155) feet seven (7) inches tall tower with six flush mounted antennas within an existing non-conforming electric power tower and associated ground equipment
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA, Rural Areas-; agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots)
SECTION: 10.2.2 (48) which allows for Tier III personal wireless facilities in the RA Zoning District
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Rural Areas – Preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic, and scenic resources/ density (.5 unit/acre in development lots)
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: NO
LOCATION: 1450 Owensville RD [State Route 678]
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 05800-00-00-06600
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller
(Gerald Gatobu)

Mr. Gatobu presented a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the request for the Eagleburger Tier III tower.

- The most important principle for siting personal wireless facilities in Albemarle County is visibility.
- This application is a Tier III personal wireless facility because it does not meet the Tier II criteria found in section 5.1.40.(d).(6).
- A field visit was conducted on March 30, 2011.
- The proposed monopole will be 155 feet 7 inches tall. Six antennas will be flush-mounted to the monopole and associated ground equipment installed.
- The monopole will be installed within an existing electric power tower (opportunity site). It will go right in the middle with some flush-mounted antennas on it.
- The tower will serve a public purpose by providing cell phone coverage along Owensville Road [State Route 678] and the Meriwether Lewis Elementary School.
- There will be no loss of historic and scenic resources related to the installation of the tower because the electric power tower exists and it has existing antennas and ground equipment attached.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed monopole antennas and associated ground equipment with the conditions as outlined in the staff report. The Planning Commission needs to recommend approval/denial of a modification to Subsection 5.1.40.(d)(6).

Mr. Zobrist invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Valerie Long, representative for AT&T, presented a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the location of the monopole to the elementary school and explain the proposal.

- This is one of the five sites where AT&T is working with the School Board to provide wireless telecommunication services at five of the schools that currently do not have any AT&T service anywhere nearby. Originally, they were looking for a site on the school property where they could locate a brown treetop style pole in the trees. Unfortunately, there is not anywhere they could have hidden it. The trees are either next to a stream at a very much lower elevation or it is open ball fields. The school building itself is not tall enough to attach the antennas directly to it. When that did not work out, they looked for an existing structure.
- Therefore, the tall existing Dominion Power poles are an opportunity site as described in the County's Wireless Policy and in the Wireless Ordinance. The ordinance essentially creates incentives to co-locate the antennas on existing structures. This tall pole would provide a good opportunity site.
- She reviewed several photo simulations and propagation maps to show the coverage. The monopole would be screened from the road. It will provide in-building coverage at the school, which is the primary coverage objective. It will also provide strong coverage in buildings all along Owensville Road. There are a number of residences in that area. It does not quite make the connection down to 250. That is still on their to do list.

Mr. Zobrist invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Morris said he had one point of clarity. When they place the cell phone tower inside of an electrical pole does that foul up the reception or the transmission.

Ms. Long replied that they work very closely with Dominion Power and the applicant to coordinate the installation with the power company to minimize interruptions. She was not exactly sure how it works. AT&T works very closely with Dominion Power who is essentially the landlord. AT&T has to have two leases for sites like this. They get a tower lease from the owner of the tower, Dominion Tower, and then a land lease from the owner of the land. In this case, it would be Mr. Eagleburger or his heirs for the ground equipment. She did not know if they would have to shut things down, but they obviously do it so as to minimize any interruptions.

Mr. Zobrist opened the public hearing and invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Smith pointed out that he lived near the tower location and when driving down the road the tower would not be seen.

Motion: Mr. Smith moved and Mr. Morris seconded to recommend approval of SP-2011-00004 Eagleburger Property AT&T CV352 Tier III PWSF with a Zoning Ordinance modification from Subsection 5.1.40(d)(6) subject to staff's recommended conditions.

1. The monopole shall not be increased in height.
2. The current owner and any subsequent owners shall submit a report to the Zoning Administrator once (1) per year, by no later than July 1 of that year. The report shall identify each user of the tower and that each user is a personal wireless communications service provider;
3. The facility shall be disassembled and removed from the site within ninety (90) days of the date its use for personal wireless communications services purposes is discontinued.
4. All work shall be done in general accord with what is described in the applicant's request and site construction plans, entitled "Eagleburger Property CV352 Meriwether Lewis Elementary School 1450 Owensville Road Charlottesville, VA 22901 with an Engineer's seal and revised zoning drawings dated 4/12/2011 "

Mr. Kamptner asked if the motion includes the recommended conditions and also the recommendation regarding the modification identified by staff, and Mr. Smith replied yes.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Zobrist noted that SP-2011-00004, Eagleburger Property AT&T CV352 Tier III PWSF would go the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval with the modification identified by staff subject to the recommended conditions on a date to be determined.

Work Session:

Comprehensive Plan Update

Work session to review the schedule, focus areas, and goals for the Comprehensive Plan update (Elaine Echols)

Mr. Benish introduced the new staff person Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner. Mr. Sorrell and Ms. Echols have been doing the bulk of the work on this staff report. Unfortunately, Ms. Echols is out of town.

The following PowerPoint presentation was given:

CPA-2013-00001, Comprehensive Plan update
Planning Commission Work Session
July 26, 2011

Background

- 1989 – Last Overall Plan Rewrite
- Section Updates have been ongoing:
  - Land Use Plan Update (1996)
  - Natural Resources and Cultural Assets (1999)
  - Land Use Plan – Neighborhood Model (2001)
  - Affordable Housing Policy (2004)
  - Rural Area Plan (2005)
  - Land Use Plan - Transportation Section (2005)
  - Land Use Plan - Community Facilities (part) (2007)
  - Economic Development Policy (2009)
  - Land Use Plan – Four Master Plans (2004, 2008, 2010 and 2011)

According to the Code of Virginia, localities are required to review their Comprehensive Plans every five years. The last adoption of all of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan at the same time was in 1989. The Land Use element was last reviewed and adopted in its entirety in 1996. Since 1996, the County has updated sections of the Comprehensive Plan as part of an ongoing review.

An unintended result of the incremental approach to updating the Comprehensive Plan is that the document has become very long, somewhat disjointed, and difficult for the public to follow. In addition, some sections of the Plan have not received a complete review since 1996. In February 2010, the Board directed staff to make the update to the plan a priority project for the Community Development Department.

Tonight's Work Session

A. Relationship of County Plan update to Livability Project and City Comprehensive Plan update
B. Provide a summary of the recent citizen survey
C. Review methodology for plan update, including focus areas
D. Review Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives and more concise format
E. PC input on other areas which need revisiting

A. Grant & City-County Work

PDC staff is assisting City and County:

- Facilitating public input opportunities
- Providing background info on areas of mutual interest:
  - Land use where the entities abut;
  - Regional transportation including Entrance Corridors;
  - Environmental systems including greenways;
  - Housing and regional economic drivers; and
  - Community facilities and services.

- The City and County Planning commission's held a joint meeting in March to discuss the Livability Grant, its products and the relationship of the grant to the city and county's update of their comprehensive plan. In essence, the grant is intended to measure the progress of the region of the city and the county along with the MPO's efforts to implement the sustainability accords, which were incorporated into our comprehensive plans in 1998 and to provide recommendations for how to further implement and achieve those sustainability accord goals.

- Some of the benefits of the grant work are that they are receiving a much more enhanced public input process than they could have otherwise have done with just county staff. TJPDC staff through the grant resources and the additional staff that the grant resources provided that TJPDC staff is developing public input workshops based around topic areas that are relevant and important both the city's and county's comprehensive plan and the sustainability grant. Those workshops similar to the kick off they had in May is a type of public input that they did not have the manpower to do just with our county staff. The TJPDC staff is also providing the data for some of that information particularly for background areas that are of mutual interest to the city, county and University. Those areas are transportation, environmental policies, land use, economic drivers, housing, and facilities-service provisions.

- Staff will bring back more information regarding these topic areas at future joint City/County Planning Commission meetings. The next joint PC meeting is August 16th (then September).

- He circulated a six page executive summary

B. 2011 Citizen Survey

- National Citizen Survey (NCS) conducted by IMCA
- Gathered citizen input about characteristics of the community & services provided by the county
- Was timed so results would inform the County's strategic and comprehensive planning processes
- Summary of results was included in Attachment A

In 2011, the County contracted with International City/County Management Association (ICMA) National Citizen Survey (The NCS) to conduct a survey of residents' opinions about the

characteristics of the community and services provided by Albemarle County. The NCS was developed by the National Research Center, Inc. in cooperation with the ICMA. The timing of this statistically valid survey was such that the results would inform both the County's strategic and comprehensive planning processes.

The NCS survey is a more standardized approach than the County's previous efforts, so the results can be compared with benchmark communities across the nation. Throughout the country, certain public services, such as public safety, tend to rank higher than other services, so having the ability to compare the ranking of services between Albemarle County and benchmark communities provides additional and significant information for planning purposes.

- Staff distributed the six page summary mentioned in the staff report. He suggested that they look at summary and come back to discuss it further at a later work session
- He highlighted several of the findings that were relative to the comp plan update.
    - Some of the more favorable characteristics of our community were the overall image and reputation; the overall appearance of our community; the quality of our natural environment; and the educational opportunities.
    - Some of the least favorable characteristics of the community were basically transportation related, bus travel, rail travel, bicycle travel, and also the accessibility of affordable childcare.
    - For zoning and land use there was a fairly low response 44 percent felt that land use, planning, and zoning was excellent or good. Interestingly, they were very consistent with national and like type community bench marks. It tends to be their observation that is the type of response they get for this sort of question because change in development is generally seen as a negative. They tend to get lower scores in this area and the bench marks of other localities tend to merit that. However, again they did get somewhat lower scores in that area.

C. Methodology & Proposed Schedule

Currently:

- Review consolidation of existing Plan goals and objectives - identifying areas in need of study;
- Review list of expansion area requests for familiarization by PC;

Sept. 2011 to March 2012:

- Receive general input at workshops for the Livability Project for Land Use, Environment, Transportation, Economic Drivers, Housing, and Transportation;
- Hold joint PC work sessions with City on areas of mutual interest;

Oct. 2011 to Jan. 2012:

- With PC, hold separate work sessions with the PC on identified focus areas in Plan;

February 2012 to May 2012:

- staff will do the writing part of the Comprehensive Plan to then bring back for PC review;

Completion:

- Expected public hearing(s) Summer/Fall 2012 with expected adoption by the Board in early 2013

Regarding the METHODOLOGY AND GENERAL SCHEDULE FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

- Staff has developed this methodology and proposed schedule for the update:
- Staff requested comments.

C. Focus Areas
- Interstate interchange policy
- Industrial land designations
- Capacity for development in the Development Areas and expansion area requests
- Rural land use
- Urban agriculture
- General land use and transportation for Neighborhoods 4, 5, 6 & 7 (including potential reduction of the Development Area boundaries to remove the Biscuit Run property)

As with the Crozet Master Plan Update, staff is not anticipating changes to the County's overarching goals in the Comprehensive Plan. Discussion is expected in these focus areas where the Commission may make additional recommendations after study.

In addition to the Focus Areas, staff plans to bring two other sets of changes to the Commission. The proposed changes are 1) making sections of the comprehensive plan more "current" with updated information and 2) making changes to the text and maps to standardize format and reduce bulk. An example in the first area would be eliminating a strategy where action has taken place, such as adoption of an ordinance to achieve a goal. has been pursued or an objective has been satisfied. An example in the second area would be to standardize land use colors and categories that are different among several master plans. All of this information is in the attachment entitled, "Updates for Comprehensive Plan by Category."

Staff requested comments.

D. Goals, Objectives –
Plan Hierarchy
- Goals: set direction
- Objectives: guide action
- Strategies: methods of action

All comprehensive planning efforts begin with a set of goals for a community. Albemarle is fortunate to have a long history of land use planning on which to base land use and fiscal decisions. Unfortunately, Albemarle also has at least 72 pages devoted to goals, objectives, and strategies. Some of these goals, objectives, and strategies were developed at different times and there is considerable overlap. In an effort to remove the overlap and concisely state the goals, staff has consolidated the statements into the attached 20 page set of goals, and objectives (Attachment B of staff report). The topics fall into 7 major categories:

Vision and Core Values
Growth Management
Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources
Economic Development and Housing
Land Use

Transportation
Community Facilities

In some cases, staff has retained the exact wording of a goal or objective that is in the existing Comprehensive Plan. In other cases, where a goal is stated several different ways in several different sections of the document, staff has tried to state the goal in a way that is simple but retains the intended meaning. In addition, as staff has consolidated statements, it has also attempted to add statements which reflect County policy but which are not stated specifically as goals at this time. For example, the Biodiversity goals in the Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources section are written in a way, which suggests that the goals are the same for both the Rural Areas and Development Areas. To better reflect that these goals are not necessarily the same, staff has added words. Wherever staff has added language, it is noted. Otherwise, the goals can be found in the sections of the Comprehensive Plan that are identified in Attachment B.

Plan Vision & Core Values

VISION
Albemarle County will have beautiful Rural Areas and pedestrian-friendly urban areas. It will continue to be a desirable place in which to grow up, raise a family and grow old. The educational system will be world class and the County's quality of life will be exceptional. The core values of the residents and property owners will guide planning for Albemarle.
CORE VALUES
The residents and property owners in Albemarle County value:

- natural resources, rural character and visual beauty
- existing neighborhoods and neighborhood identities
- a diversity of businesses and employment opportunities that create a stable economy
- distinctive urban and Rural Areas
- high quality services and facilities
- education and lifelong learning
- a diversity of housing choices which is affordable for all income levels
- public safety

To begin the goals section, staff has added a "vision" and "core values" page. A vision statement and core values has appeared in strategic plans for the County many times. In the attachment, staff has attempted to state the vision once again and reflect the core values that have been expressed many times by the community. The Commission is asked to affirm the vision and core values as part of the overall comprehensive plan update.

Generalized Goals

Growth Management

- Retain distinctions between DA and RA
- Plan for growth
- Don't allow new development to hurt quality of life

Economy

- Have a diversity of employment opportunities that create a stable economy

Natural Resources

- Retain Systems of mountains and steep slopes
- Protect water quality
- Have undeveloped floodplain
- Have undeveloped wetlands

Cultural and Historic Resources

- Retain and preserve resources that are unique to Albemarle County.

Land Use

- DA: Have high quality development areas as places for new growth and redevelopment
- RA: Have thriving agricultural and forestal activities in the rural areas and minimal with minimal residential development.

Transportation

- Have safe and efficient transportation networks.

Community Facilities and Utilities

- Have a safe, well-educated community with efficient and excellent facilities and services.

Recommendation

- Focus Areas – review, provide feedback & affirm
- Methodology – review & provide feedback
- Consolidated Goals & Objectives – review & affirm or ask for additional study
- ONGOING WORK OF STAFF:
- At present, staff is working on the capacity analysis for land use and initial reviews of the expansion area requests. Staff will be contacting the applicants for additional information on their individual requests in early August. The capacity analysis and the additional information will be brought to the Commission in October.

- RECOMMENDATION:
- Staff recommends the Commission review and provide feedback on the proposed focus areas and methodology for framing the goals, objectives, and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan update. Staff asks that the Commission affirm the Focus Areas. Finally, staff asks that the Commission review the consolidated goals and objectives to affirm or ask for additional study in particular areas.

During the work session, the Planning Commission reviewed the schedule, focus areas, and goals for the Comprehensive Plan update. Staff requested feedback on the following:

- Focus Areas – review, provide feedback & affirm

The Planning Commission agreed with the focus areas for the Comp Plan review as presented by staff.

- Methodology & Scheduling – review & provide feedback

The Commission agreed with the methodology and scheduling submitted by staff

- Consolidated Goals & Objectives – review & affirm or ask for additional study

The Commission was in general agreement with the existing goals with some comments and suggestions for further consideration.

The Commission expressed interest in organizing the goals and associated objectives and strategies under the core value(s) they support.

Staff also provided a summary of The National Citizen Survey Albemarle County, VA 2011 for the Commission's information.

Public comment was taken from the following persons:

- Neil Williamson, Free Enterprise Forum, submitted written comments that he hoped the Commission would take under advisement. (Attachment A) He thought it was imperative that they take a good hard look at the process and the methodology they are going to use. There is one goal in the Comp Plan that he is adamantly opposed to. Overall, he thought they have a very solid Comp Plan. However, it does not matter what he or the Commission thinks. In the end it matters what the Board thinks. The Commission needs to check back with the Board for feedback. It is a laborious process. They need to take a good hard look at the objectives set forth in step one and then get step one signed off on by the Board. Then they should come back and do step two and three.
- Jeff Werner, Piedmont Environmental Council, expressed the need for the Comprehensive Plan to factor in the defense intelligence facilities, the western bypass, and Route 29 north of the western bypass. He thought they were a place people want to be because of the documents they have. They still don't know how much growth has been approved and how much of that approved growth has been built. They don't know how the building permits line up with what has been approved, etc. They need that information.

The following is a summary of specific suggestions made by Commissioners:

Ms. Monteith's Comments:

- Liked having a vision and core values – however, some of the language in the vision was "feeling" and some was "factual." It needs to stay consistent with the type of language used and language should be defensible.

Mr. Franco's Comments:

- Stated that the core values need to more directly relate to the goals and objectives. Relating core values will further help to reduce redundancy.
- Goals could be grouped under the core values.
- Goals could be grouped by rural area and development area, though such a grouping would likely get quite complicated.
- Goals should be prioritized and they should recognize what goals are achievable.

Mr. Morris' Comments:

- Questioned what a "World-class education system" actually was – does this phrase actually add value?
- On page 4 of 20 in the last goal – "avoid premature expansion of the development area.", he would like to see that in the Pantops Master Plan and Places29.

Ms. Porterfield's Comments:

- Ms. Porterfield indicated that 4 of the 6 suggested focus areas seemed to fit together – the focus areas of the interstate interchange policy and the industrial land designations and the focus areas of the DAs capacity for development and the focus area of general land use and transportation for neighborhoods 4 through 7 (which includes the potential reduction of DA boundaries to remove the Biscuit Run property).
- Stated that some expansion area should be at interstate interchanges – the interstate interchange policy should be reviewed to include interchange land area.
- Stated that having a vision and core values was a good idea – they set the tone.
- Stated that in the vision, the portion that said "…in which to grow up, raise a family and grow old." It should not imply that everyone will be here from birth to death and that the last two words should say: "and/or grow old" to ensure the vision is not excluding people.

Ms. Porterfield's Specific Comments to Attachment B:

- Growth Management, "Overall Growth Management," Goal 1, Objective 5 (page 2 of 20) – Will a gentler rather than a "hard edge" be better?
- Growth Management, "Sustainability," Goal 1, Objective 4 (page 3 of 20) – Should not an increase in storage capacity also be addressed here?
- Growth Management, "Sustainability," Goal 1, Objective 8 (page 3 of 20) - Should also update this objective to reflect the current technology for waste-water disposal/use.
- Should specific language be provided for hazards regarding drinking water.
- Growth Management, "Growth Management and the Development Areas," Goal 5, Objective 1 (page 4 of 20) – Appropriate goal, however should the objective be rewritten? Does density push the form?
- Natural Resources & Cultural Assets, Sustainability, "Water Resources," "Surface Water in the Rural Areas," Goal 1, Objective 4 (page 5 of 20) – Why is the Moorman River the only one addressed? Needs to be more general.
- Natural Resources & Cultural Assets, Sustainability, "Water Resources," "Surface Water in the Development Areas," Goal 1, Objective 1 (page 6 of 20) – Why is Crozet the only one addressed? Needs to be more general.
- Natural Resources & Cultural Assets, "Sustainability," "Scenic Resources," Goal 1, Objective 1 (page 8 of 20) – ensure that this objective also permits new technologies such as telecommunication facilities.
- Economic Development & Housing, "Economic Development," Goal 1 (page 10 of 20) – add an additional objective to state that Albemarle works to bring new employers to the County.

- Land Use – Rural Areas, "Fiscal & Tax Tools," Goal 1 (page 13 of 20) – a new goal is needed to state that rural parcels should pay taxes to at least cover the cost the county incurs to provide services to these areas.
- Transportation, "Streets and Roadways", "Development Areas," Goal 1, Objective 1 (page 17 of 20) – Just references Places 29 Master Plan – should be more general.
- Transportation, "Streets and Roadways," "Development Areas," Goal 2 (page 17 of 20) – Need to also add to provide for mobility and access for police and emergency medical vehicles.
- Community Services, "Utilities," "Water Provisions and Sewage Disposal," Objective 3 (page 20 of 20) – where this objective states "Only allow changes in jurisdictional areas outside of designated Development Areas in cases where property is: (1) adjacent to existing lines…" Adjacent to existing lines should also include across a street. This should also be noted as permitted only on a case-by-case basis.
- Community Services, "Service Standards" (page 20 of 20) – Stated that all development area services should be equal and if not we should strive to ensure each development area has comparable services.

The Commission commented on the information provided and asked staff to take their comments into consideration in the continuing work on the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Porterfield provided specific suggestions and provided written comments. Some Commissioners provided suggestions at the meeting, and other Commissioners indicated they would provide any further comments in writing.

Staff noted additional feedback could be provided by Commissioners via email or in written form.

No formal action was taken.

Old Business:

Mr. Zobrist asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business:

Mr. Zobrist asked if there was any new business.

- Joint meeting with Architectural Review Board and Board of Supervisors on Wednesday, August 3, 2011 at 3:30 p.m. in Room #241.

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

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m. to a joint meeting with the Architectural Review Board and Board of Supervisors on Wednesday, August 3, 2011 at 3:30

p.m. at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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

Attachment A – 7-26-2011 Planning Commission Minutes

July 26, 2011

Comments to the Albemarle County Planning Commission

2012 Comprehensive Plan Vision and Core Values

Good Evening, I am Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum, a privately funded public policy organization covering-the City of Charlottesville, as well as-the Counties of Albemarle, Greene Fluvanna, Louisa and Nelson.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today regarding your 2012 Comprehensive Goals by Category Draft document.

I will be very specific in my comments referencing the document.

Page 2 Overall Growth Management Free Enterprise Forum believes you should add an objective to have adequate land available in the development area to accommodate 20 years of projected growth. This objective would be agreement with current state law.

Page 3 Sustainability objective 2 The Free Enterprise Forum strongly recommends the elimination of objective number 2. We have steadfastly opposed Albemarle County getting into the population control business.

Page 3 Sustainability Objective 7 &8 Sustainability is not well defined in either of these objectives We encourage a better more concrete definition in these objectives.

Page Growth Management Goal 2 Objective 1 Add the phrase "While protecting property rights," to the beginning of the sentence

Page -4 Growth Management-and the Development Areas Goal #3 reads "Provide infrastructure and services to support new development" The Free Enterprise Forum believes the words "existing and" should be inserted prior to new development

Page-4 Growth Management and the Development Areas Goal #5 is Pejorative. Rather than" Avoid premature expansion of the Development Areas" The Free Enterprise Forum believes the goal should read "Maximize Development Area Utilization"

Page-5 Water Resources Objective number 2 discusses the proliferation of septic systems in the rural areas The Free Enterprise Forum does not believe there is significant evidence to support that the proliferation of health department inspected, well designed and operated septic systems have a negative impact on the rural areas. We feel this objective should be removed.

Page 5 Surface Water in-the Rural Areas Objective 4 Why identify the Moorman's river over all other surface water? Isn't the Meechum's river and Rivanna deserving of equal protection?

Page 6 Stormwater Management

Objective 1 add the term or mitigating after the word minimizing

Page 7 Biodiversity and Biological Resources

Goal The Free Enterprise Forum takes exception to the use of the word "ethical" in describing county benefits. We ask this term be removed.

Page 8 Critical Slopes in the **Development Areas** The Free Enterprise: Forum is a proponent - for maximizing the use of land in the development areas for development (as referenced on Goal 5 on Page 4) thus we ask for this goal to be reworded "Protect critical slopes in the development areas that are a part of stream valleys."

Page 9 Historic Resources Objective 2 The free Enterprise Forum believes the word protection should be removed from this objective.

Page 13 Fiscal and Tax Tools The Free Enterprise Forum questions the use of the words" negative impacts" and wonders whether "inconsistent with other aspects of the comprehensive plan" would be a better wording

Page 14 Interstate interchange Development Objective-2 The Free Enterprise Forum. Is unclear how Objective 2 supports the goal' stated on the same page.

Page 15 Land Use Development Areas Goal 3 Objective, l The Free Enterprise Forum strongly encourages the inclusion of flexibility to this objective.

Page 16 Transportation Goal The Free Enterprise Forum suggests changing the middle line to recognize the importance of transportation to economic vitality. The new language would read, “which supports the growth management policy, the economic vitality policy and provides for necessary Public Safety".

Page 16. Transportation Objective 2 references Vehicular Miles Traveled. Absent a metric to accurately determine VMT, we suggest this language be removed.

Thank you for the opportunity to review these concerns with you, I am happy to answer any questions.